

The Classical Review

MARCH 1895.

CRITICAL NOTES ON CLEM. AL. STROM. IV.

BOOK IV.

§ 1, p. 563. ἀκόλουθον δ' ἂν οἶμαι περί τε μαρτυρίον διαλαβεῖν καὶ τίς ὁ τέλειος, οἷς ἐμπεριληφθήσεται...τὰ παρεπόμυνα καὶ ὡς ὁμοίως τ·ε· φιλοσοφητέον δούλω τε καὶ ἐλευθέρῳ κἂν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ τὸ γένος τυγχάνη, τὰ τε ἐξῆς...προσαποπληρώσαντες...παραθησόμεθα. Read εἴη for οἶμαι, or insert it before it, as we have in § 2 ἐπόμενον ἂν εἴη διαλαβεῖν, and in Str. ii. 1 ἐξῆς δ' ἂν εἴη διαλαβεῖν. Omit τε after ὁμοίως, and put a full stop after τυγχάνη.

§ 2, p. 564. τὰ περὶ ἀρχῶν φυσιολογηθέντα τοῖς τε Ἑλλήσι τοῖς τε ἄλλοις βαρβάροις ὅσοι ἦγον εἰς ἡμᾶς αἱ δόξαι ἐξιστορητέον. For ὅσον read ὅσων.

§ 3. τὸ μὲν γεγράφεται ἦν θεός γε ἐθέλη...ννὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον μετετέον. Perhaps αὐτίκα has been lost after γεγράφεται.

§ 4, p. 565. ἔστω δὲ ἡμῖν τὰ ὑπομνήματα...διὰ τοὺς ἀνέδην ἀπείρως ἐντυγχάνοντας ποικίλα ὡς αὐτὸ που τοῖνμόμ φησι διεστρωμένα. Insert καὶ before ἀπείρως and change ποικίλα into ποικίλως.

Ib. οἱ δὲ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ὄντως γένους τὸ συγγενὲς μεταλλεύοντες εὐρήσουσι τὸ πολὺ ἐν ὀλίγῳ, εὐρήσει γὰρ τὸν συνήσοντα ἓνα ἢ γραφή. For ὄντως (which would imply a previous mention of the χρ.) read ὄντες, comparing § 16 φήσομεν τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους εἶναι. [H.J. calls my attention to τῇ θεῖα ὄντως ἱεροφαντίᾳ in § 3, and τῆς βασιλικῆς ὄντως ὁδοῦ in § 5, and suggests that C. is here distinguishing between his own application of the Platonic myth and the myth itself.] We might be disposed to omit ἓνα, but see i. § 182, p. 427 Πλάτων ἓνα τὸν νομοθέτην φησιν, NO. LXXVI. VOL. IX.

ἐν δὲ τοῖς Νόμοις ἓνα τὸν συνήσοντα τῶν μουσικῶν.¹

Ib. δεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡμᾶς τοῖς (the Stromateis) προσεκπονέειν καὶ προσεφευρίσκειν ἕτερα, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ὁδὸν ἀπιοῦσιν ἦν οὐκ ἴσασιν ἀρκεῖ τὴν φέρονσαν ὑποσημῆναι μόνον. § 5. βαδιστέον δὲ τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα ἤδη καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξευρητέον. Should we not read ἡμᾶς here? C. is urging his readers to do their part, not simply receiving directions from others, but following up the true path themselves. Put a comma after μόνον and write ἐξευρητέον.

§ 6, p. 565. εἰκότως οὖν πολὺ τὸ γόνιμον ἐν ὀλίγῳ σπέρματων ἐμπεριεχομένων τῇδε τῇ πραγματείᾳ δογμάτων. Should we not read σπέρματι τῶν for σπερμάτων, 'Great is the productiveness which the doctrines contained in this treatise inclose in a small seed'?

§ 8, p. 566. ἡ μοι δοκεῖ τὸ σάββατον δι' ἀποχῆς κακῶν ἐγκράτειαν αἰνίσσασθαι καὶ τι ποτ' ἐστὶν ᾧ διαφέρει θηρίων ἀνθρώπου. τοῦτου τε αὖ οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγγελοὶ σοφώτεροι. For τί read ὅτι (from ὅστις), and for τε read δέ.

§ 9, p. 567. ἡ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ Πυθαγόρας σοφὸν μὲν εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λέγων μόνον, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ γράφει: [εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος] μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἑαυτὸν δὲ...φιλόσοφον. Read λέγειν for λέγων. The words in square brackets have no

¹ I am obliged to Dr. Jackson for the reference to Legg. ii. 658 E, ἐκείνην εἶναι Μοῦσαν καλλίστην ἥτις τοὺς βελτίστους καὶ ἱκανῶς πεπαιδευμένους τέρπει, μάλιστα δὲ ἥτις ἓνα τὸν ἀρετῇ τε καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντα.

meaning or construction as they stand, and should probably be placed after Χριστοῦ. Faith and philosophy would thus be coupled as human, in contrast to wisdom which is divine. Perhaps the disarrangement may have been due to a reader who observed that the order was different in the Ep. to the Romans. The sentence will be made clearer if we put brackets before ἐπεὶ and after Χριστοῦ (or rather γνωρισθέντος, according to the proposed order). [I.B. would insert αἰνίττεσθαι after Πυθαγόρας.]

Ib. ζοικεν δ' οἶμαι Κενταύρῳ [Θετταλικῷ πλάσματι]. The words in square brackets seem to be a gloss of the same kind as we had in i. p. 342, explaining τῆς βασάνου λίθου.

§ 11, p. 568. οὐκ οὖν πάθος τοῦ φόβου γεννητικός ὁ νόμος. Read with Sylburg πάθος for the πάθος of MS., which Dindorf omits. C. does not deny that the Law causes fear (*i.e.* the rational avoidance of evil), but only that it produces the *passion* of fear. [Perhaps insert ἐμποίων after πάθος. I.B.]

§ 14, p. 569. οὗτος οὖν φόβος τὸ ἀρνεῖσθαι Χριστὸν διὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν ἐκκλίνει, ἵνα δὴ φόβος μάρτυς γένηται. οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ ἐλπίδι δωρεῶν ἡτοίμασμένων πιπράσκων τὴν πίστιν ἀγάπῃ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον ἀσμενέστατα τοῦδε τοῦ βίου ἀπολυθήσεται. Insert οὐ after οὖν and put a colon after γένηται. C. is here contrasting the motive of love which actuates the true gnostic (τὸν δι' ἀγάπης πιστόν as he is called in the preceding section) with the lower motives of fear and hope. In like manner we read (§ 29, p. 576) δεῖν δ' οἶμαι μήτε διὰ φόβον κολάσεως μήτε διὰ τινα ἐπαγγελίαν δόσεως, δι' αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν προσελθῆναι τῷ σωτηριῷ λόγῳ.

§ 15, p. 570. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἐν πολέμῳ μετ' ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὐδὲν οὗτοι διαφέροντες εἰ καὶ νόσῳ κατεμαραίνοντο. Compare the preceding section where death in battle was contrasted with death on a sick bed (οὐ προκαμίων τῇ ψυχῇ οὐδὲ καταμαλακισθεὶς οἷα περὶ τὰς νόσους πάσχουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι) and insert ἢ before εἰ.

Ib. εἰ τοίνυν ἢ πρὸς θεὸν ὁμολογία μαρτυρία ἐστὶ, πᾶσα ἢ καθαρῶς πολιτευσαμένη ψυχὴ μετ' ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς ἐπακηκουῖα μάρτυς ἐστὶ καὶ βίῳ καὶ λόγῳ, ὅπως ποτὲ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλάττεται, οἷον αἷμα τὴν πίστιν ἀνὰ τὸν βίον ἅπαντα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐξοδὸν προσχέουσα. Should not we omit the article before ταῖς ἐντολαῖς, putting a comma after ψυχῇ and before μάρτυς, and read ἀπαλλάττεται? I think too that πρὸς should be taken as a preposition and followed by a dative τῇ ἐξόδῳ, 'pouring forth his faith like the blood of the sacrifice through-

out his life and especially at his death.' [I.B. would keep to the text, translating, I suppose, 'pouring forth his faith during his life, and above all his martyrdom, like sacrificial blood.] In the sentence which follows, ὁ κύριος... φησὶν ὅς ἂν καταλείψῃ πατέρα... ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος μου, μακάριος οὗτος [οὗ τὴν ἀπλὴν ἐμφαίνων μαρτυρίαν ἀλλὰ τὴν γνωστικὴν] ὡς κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου πολιτευσάμενος διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀγάπης, γνώσιν γὰρ σημαίνει ἢ τοῦ ὀνόματος εἰδήσεις καὶ ἢ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου νόμους, I think the words in square brackets should be placed before γνώσιν, which supplies a reason for γνωστικὴν, while at the same time the nom. πολιτευσάμενος is brought into relation with the subject οὗτος.

§ 18, p. 572. ἐν γοῦν τῷ ζῆν τὸ εὖ ζῆν κατορθοῦται καὶ εἰς ξὺν αἰδιότητος παραπέμπεται ὁ διὰ σώματος μελετήσας εὐζωΐαν. Transfer εὖ before the first ζῆν, 'life is perfected by living well.'

§ 23, p. 574. ὁ Πλοῦτος, φησὶ, πλέον θάτερον βλέποντας παραλαβὸν τυφλοὺς ποιεῖ. The original preserved in Stobaeus has καθάπερ ἱατρός κακὸς instead of θατέρον πλέον. Did C. write ἱατροῦ τρόπον? The first syllable of τρόπον may have been lost after the preceding -τρον, and -πον changed into πλέον.

§ 24, p. 574. ἐν τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ὁ Εὐριπίδης πεποίηκεν. εἰρηταί γε ἡ πενία σοφίαν ἔλαχε διὰ τὸ δυστυχῆσαι. Perhaps καὶ εἰκότως may have been lost before εἰρηται. [I.B. suggests τε for γε.]

§ 25-26, p. 575. κἂν διψῇ διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μαρτυρεῖ δικαιοσύνην τὸ ἀριστον τυγχάνειν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ κλαίων... διὰ δικαιοσύνην μαρτυρεῖ τῷ βελτίστῳ νόμῳ εἶναι καλῶ. Perhaps we should read τῷ νόμῳ εἶναι καλῶ καὶ βελτίστῳ.

Ib. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς καλοὺς κ.τ.λ. Place a comma instead of a full stop before ὁμοίως. The accusatives depend on the preceding μακαρίζει.

§ 27, p. 575. After quoting ὁ γὰρ εὐρὼν (MS. ἐρὼν) τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν C. continues ὁ τοίνυν ἐπιγνώσκων... ἁμαρτωλὸν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἥς ἀπέσπασται, ἀπολέσας δὲ εὐρήσει κατὰ τὴν ὑπακοὴν τὴν ἀναζητήσαν μὲν τῇ πίστει ἀποθανοῦσαν δὲ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. C. appears here either intentionally or unintentionally, to have confused ἀπολέσει with ἀπολύσει. In p. 679 the form ἀπολύειν is used in a similar connexion, χρῆναι γὰρ ἀπολύειν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῶν τούτου ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ψυχὴν. Perhaps τὴν should be omitted before ἀναζήτησαν.

§ 28, p. 576. εὐλογον ἐξαγωγῇ τῷ σπονδαίῳ συγχωροῦσι καὶ οἱ φιλόσοφοι, εἰ τις τοῦ πράσσειν αὐτὸν οὕτως τηρήσειεν αὐτῶν, ὡς μηκέτι ἀπολειφθῆαι αὐτῷ μηδὲ ἐλπίδα τῆς πράξεως. Read with Arceus οὕτως στερεώσιν and for αὐτῶν, which may have crept in from the preceding αὐτὸν or the following αὐτῷ, read perhaps ἀνάγκη.

§ 34, p. 579. μὴ μερινῶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ἡμῶν τι φάγητε, μηδὲ τὸ σῶμα τί περιβάλλητε. Read with Potter τῷ σώματι <τί> περιβάλλητε.

§ 36-37, p. 579. εἰσὶ γὰρ παρὰ κυρίῳ καὶ μισθοὶ καὶ μοναὶ πλείονες κατὰ ἀναλογίαν βίων· ὅς γὰρ ἂν δέξεται, φησὶ, προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήψεται... πάλιν τε αὐτὰς κατ' ἀξίαν διαφορὰς τῆς ἀρετῆς, εὐγενεῖς ἀμοιβὰς διὰ τῶν ὥρων τῶν οὐχ ὁμοίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἐκάστου τῶν ἐργατῶν ἀποδοθέντος ἴσου μισθοῦ, τοῦτέστι τῆς σωτηρίας, [τὸ ἐπ' ἴσης δίκαιον μεμίνυκεν διὰ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀκαταλλήλους ὥρας ἐργασαμένων]. § 37 ἐργάζονται μὲν οὐν καὶ τὰς μονὰς τῆς ἀναλόγου ὡς κατηξιώθησαν γερῶν συνεργῶν τῆς ἀρετῆς οἰκονομίας καὶ λειτουργίας. Put a comma before πάλιν and a full stop after ἀρετῆς, and insert κατὰ before τὰς κατ' ἀξίαν. Rewards are given in accordance with degrees of virtue as well as with varieties of profession. Transfer the words in square brackets (prefixing to them the words πρὸς δὲ καὶ from the line above) and place them before εὐγενεῖς. The διὰ after ἀμοιβὰς perhaps represents διαλαμβανόντων. The second sentence will then (omitting τοῦ before ἐκάστῳ) read as follows: πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐπ' ἴσης δίκαιον μεμίνυκεν διὰ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀκαταλλήλους ὥρας ἐργασαμένων, εὐγενεῖς ἀμοιβὰς <διαλαμβανόντων> τῶν ὥρων τῶν οὐχ ὁμοίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἐργατῶν ἀποδοθέντος ἴσου μισθοῦ. In the first sentence of § 37 omit the καὶ before λειτουργίας and insert it before κατὰ, translating 'In the mansions corresponding to the prerogatives of which they were deemed worthy, they will be engaged in public services co-operant with the Divine (ineffable) Economy.'

§ 38, p. 580. ἐνίστε γὰρ βουλόμεθα... ἔλεον ποιῆσαι... καὶ οὐχ οἷοί τε ἔσμεν ἥτοι διὰ πενίαν ἢ νόσον... ἐξυπηρετῆσαι τῇ προαίρεσει ἐφ' ὃν ὁρμώμεθα μὴ δυνηθέντες ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν ὁ βεβουλόμεθα. Put a comma after προαίρεσει, and for ἐφ' ὃν read ἀφ', 'not being able from our existing resources to carry out what we have desired.'

Ib. p. 581. τῆς αὐτῆς τιμῆς μεθέξουσιν τοῖς δυνηθεῖσιν οἱ βεβουλόμενοι, ὃν ἡ προαίρεσις ἴση καὶ πλοκεκτώσιν ἕτεροι τῇ περιουσίᾳ. Should we not read ἄτεροι?

§ 39, p. 581. After quoting the beatitude 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they

shall see God,' C. continues καθαροὺς οὖν κατὰ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας καὶ τοὺς ἀγίους διαλογισμοὺς τοὺς εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀφικνουμένους εἶναι βούλεται, ὅταν μὴδὲν ἔχη νόθον ἐπιπροσθῶν τῇ δυνάμει ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. Perhaps we should read ἄλλους for ἀγίους.

§ 40, p. 581. μακάριοι τοίνυν οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί. τὸν ἀντιστρατοῦντα νόμον τῷ φρονήματι τοῦ νοῦ ἡμῶν... τιθασσεύσαντες καὶ ἐξημερώσαντες, οἱ μετ' ἐπιστήμης... καταβιβάσαντες εἰς νιοθεσίαν ἀποκατασταθήσονται. Put a comma after εἰρηνοποιοί, and read οἱ for οἱ.

Ib. εἴη δ' ἂν ἡ τελεία εἰρηνοποίησις ἡ... φυλάσσουσα τὸ εἰρηνικὸν ἅγιον τε καὶ καλὴν τὴν διοίκησιν λέγοιτο. Should we not read ὁμολογοῦσα for λέγουσα?

§ 43, p. 582. κἂν ὑπεραποθάνης τοῦ πλησίον δι' ἀγάπην, πλησίον δὲ ἡμῶν τὸν σωτήρα ὑπολάβης, θεὸς γὰρ ἐγγίζων ὁ σώζων πρὸς τὸ σωζόμενον ἐλέχθη, θάνατον ἐλόμενος διὰ ζωὴν καὶ σπαντοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκεῖνον ἐνεκεν παθόν. [καὶ μὴ τι διὰ τοῦτο ἀδελφὸς εἴρηται] ὁ δ' ἀγάπην τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν παθὼν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἔπαθε σωτηρίαν. Transfer the words in square brackets after ἐλέχθη, insert ἔσει before ἐλόμενος, and γὰρ before the second δι' ἀγάπην.

§ 44, p. 583. Θεῶν... γράφει, 'ἦν γὰρ τῷ ὄντι τοῖς κακοῖς ἐνωχία ὁ βίος, πονηρευσανέμενος ἔπειτα τελευτῶσιν, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ, [ἐρμαῖον ὁ θάνατος]. καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Φαίδωνι, 'εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ὁ θάνατος τοῦ παντὸς ἀπαλλαγὴ,' καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. The words in square brackets should be inserted after ἀπαλλαγὴ. The following καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς refer to the remainder of the sentence in *Phaedo* p. 107, τοῦ τε σώματος ἅμα ἀπηλλάχθαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν κακίας μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς.

§ 45, p. 583. οὐκ ἔστιν οὖν... νοεῖν ἀπλὴν οἶμον εἰς Ἄιδου φέρειν, ὁδοὶ δὲ πολλαὶ καὶ ἀπάγουσαι ἁμαρτίας. πολυπλανεῖς τοῦτους, ὡς εἰκοι, τοὺς ἀπίστους διακωμῶδων Ἀριστοφάνης κ.τ.λ. Omit καὶ before ἀπάγουσαι, which I think agrees with ὁδοί, remove the full stop after ἁμαρτίας and place it after πολυπλανεῖς 'there are many roads leading off to Hades, sins which cause men to stray in various directions.'

§ 58, p. 590. μεστὴ μὲν οὖν πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν μελετησάντων τὸν ζῶντα θάνατον εἰς Χριστὸν παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον. For ζῶντα read perhaps ζωοποιόν. [In this, I see, I am anticipated by I. B.]

§ 61, p. 591. τῷ τύπον τὴν σιαγὸν παρὰ τὰ θῆνα ἰὴν ἑτέραν. Should we read παραδοθῆναι? [I. B. suggests παραθεῖναι or προταθῆναι.]

§ 62, p. 592. After speaking of the Amazons and other masculine women, C.

proceeds ἤδη γοῦν αἱ γυναῖκες οὐδὲν ἔλαττον τῶν ἀρρένων καὶ οἰκουροῦσι καὶ θηρεύουσι καὶ τὰς ποίμνας φυλάττουσι. He is thinking of the passage in the *Republic* (p. 451) where Plato argues from the use of female watchdogs to that of women, τὰς θηλείας τῶν φυλάκων κυνῶν πότερα συμφυλάττειν οἰόμεθα δεῖν, ἄπερ ἂν οἱ ἄρρενες φυλάττωσι, καὶ ξυνθηρεύειν καὶ τὰλλα κοινῇ πράττειν, ἢ τὰς μὲν οἰκουρεῖν ἔνδον ὡς ἀδυνάτους διὰ τὸν τῶν σκυλάκων τόκον... τοὺς δὲ πονεῖν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλειαν ἔχειν περὶ τὰ ποίμνια. Read αἱ κύνες αἱ φύλακες for αἱ γυναῖκες. Dindorf says of οἰκουροῦσι *requirunt aliud verbum*, and in Plato it is no doubt distinctive of the female, as opposed to the male; but taking it in the sense of 'guarding the house,' it applies equally to the males. [I.B. would insert κυνῶν after ἀρρένων.]

§ 63, p. 592. καὶ πῶς οὐ μάτην Εὐριπίδης ποικίλος γράφει; Read πῶς without a question, 'perhaps Euripides has some reason for the various views he gives of women.'

§ 67, p. 593. σ α φ ἦς ἡμῖν ἐκ τούτων ἢ ἐκ πίστewς ἐνότης καὶ τίς ὁ τέλειος δέδεικται. For σαφῆς read σαφῶς.

Ib. p. 594. ἀνδρὶ ἀποθνήσκειν καλὸν ὑπὲρ τε ἀρετῆς ὑπὲρ τε ἐλευθερίας ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτοῦ. Read <τῶν> ἑαυτοῦ, or else omit the last ὑπὲρ τε.

§ 63, p. 594. ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἡττηθέντες ἀποπτείσωσι τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ ἀναγκαισμάτων βουλευμάτων. The MS. ἀποπτείσωσι is thus corrected by Dindorf after Sylburg. But ἀποπτείω is not recognized by the lexx., and in any case seems less suitable than ἀποπτέωσι.

Ib. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλων ἔνεκα πραττόμενα ἡμῖν ἐκάστοτε πράτταμεν ἂν εἰς ἐκείνους ἀποβλέπειν περὶόμενοι... μέτρον ἡγούμενοι τοῦτο τὸ ἐν ἐκείνους κεχαρισμένον. Omit ἐν, or replace it by ἂν after ἐκείνους.

§ 72, p. 596. Those alone confess Christ aright whose lives witness to their confession, ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἐν εἰλημμένους αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐχόμενος ὑπὸ τούτων. Dindorf follows Grabe in reading αὐτοῖς for MS. αὐτοῦς, and would I suppose agree in his interpretation *utpote qui habitat in illis et ab iis tenetur*. L. and S. recognize ἐλλαμβάνομαι in the middle only, with the sense 'to seize hold of.' Dindorf in his Index quotes the passage under the heading ἐνελούμενος and changes the MS. spelling ἐνελημμένον in *Paed.* ii. 81, p. 219, reading στρώμασιν ἐνελημμένον. Should we not in our text take it as the middle of ἐνελέω, keeping the acc. αὐτοῦς and translating 'having incorporated them (*lit* wrapt them up), into himself'? It will thus answer to the phrase which

follows immediately, ἀρνοῦνται δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὴ ὄντες ἐν αὐτῷ and to Joh. xiv. 20 ὁμοῖς ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν, whereas the ὁμοῖς ἐν ἐμοί has no equivalent here if we accept the reading of Grabe and Dindorf.

§ 73, p. 596. ἐκείν ο δὲ οὐκ ἐπέστησεν ὅτι κ.τ.λ. Read ἐκείν 'he did not attend to this point.'

Ib. διάθεσις δὲ ὁμολογουμένη καὶ μάλιστα ἢ μὴδὲ θανάτῳ τρεπομένη ὑφ' ἑνα πάντων τῶν παθῶν... ἀποκοπὴν ποιεῖται. For ἑνα πάντων read ἐν ἀπάντων, comparing *Epict. Diss.* iii. 22, 33 ἂν αὐτοῦς οἱ Τρῶες μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωσιν; Ναί, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑφ' ἐν πάντες.

§ 75, p. 597. τελείως ὁμολογήσας καὶ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃν ἀγαπήσας ἀδελφὸν ἐγνώρισεν ὅλον ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδούς διὰ τὸν θεόν. For διὰ τὸν θεόν read δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

§ 76, p. 597. 'In warning us to flee in time of persecution, our Lord does not imply that death is an evil, but He bids us avoid giving offence,' τρόπον γάρ τινα προσαγγέλλει ἑαυτὸν περιστάσθαι. Hervetus translates *denuntiāt ut sibi met caveamus*, but can περιστάσθαι bear this force? In later Greek it means 'to avoid,' 'to keep at a distance,' implying e.g. such an object as θάνατον. If the letters were getting faint, θάνατον might be easily changed into ἑαντόν. [I.B. would read αὐτόν.]

§ 77, p. 597. οὗτος δ' ἂν εἴη ὁ μὴ περιστρελλόμενος τὸν διωγμόν. Hervetus translates *qui non vitat*, but there is no evidence of such a use. In the passage quoted by Potter (*Strom.* p. 871) οἱ περιστρελλόμενοι simply means those who take care of themselves. Perhaps we should read *περιστάμενος*. [I am inclined now to prefer *ὑποστειλλόμενος* suggested by I.B.]

§ 78, p. 598. εἰ κήδεαι ὑμῶν ὁ θεός, τι δήποτε δυνέεσθε καὶ φονεύεσθε, ἢ αὐτοῖς ἡμᾶς εἰς τοῦτο ἐκδίδωσιν; Put a mark of interrogation after φονεύεσθε, as in Potter's edition.

§ 79, p. 598. κἂν μὴ ἀδικῶμεν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδικοῦσιν ἡμῖν ὁ δικαστὴς ἀφορᾷ. Potter suggests ἐφορμᾷ, perhaps ἐφεδρεῖν. [Here too I think I.B.'s suggestion, ὑφορμᾷ, supplies the true reading.]

Ib. αὐτοῦς τε οὕτω πολιτευομένους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τὸν ὁμοῖον αἰρεῖσθαι βίον προστρεπομένους. Read προτρεπομένους.

§ 80, p. 599. τί γὰρ καὶ ἀδικούμεθα ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς θανάτῳ ἀπολυνόμενοι πρὸς τὸν κύριον; For ὡς I should prefer τό 'so far as we ourselves are concerned.'

Ib. εἰ δὲ εὐφρονοῖμεν χάριν εἰσόμεθα τοῖς τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῆς ταχείας ἀποδημίας παρεσχήμενοις, εἰ δὲ ἀγάπην μαρτυροῖμεν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, φαῦλοί τινες ἄνδρες εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς

ἐδοκούμεν ἡμεῖς. εἰ ᾗδεσαν δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, πάντες μὲν ἂν ἐπεπῆδον τῇ ὁδῷ, ἐκλογὴ δὲ οὐκ ἂν ᾗν. Potter is right, I think, in reading φρονούμεν (which was no doubt altered to suit μαρτυροῦμεν), omitting the comma before φαῖλο, and changing the full stop after ἡμεῖς into a comma. Put a full stop also after μαρτυροῦμεν and omit εἰ before ᾗδεσαν, translating 'If we had not seemed a bad sort of people to the majority, and they had themselves known the truth, all men would have pressed into the way.'

§ 81, p. 599. φημί γὰρ τὸ ὁπόσοι ὑποπίπτουσι ταῖς λεγομέναις θλίψεσιν ἧτοι ἡμαρτηκότες ἐν ἄλλοις λανθάνοντες πταίσμασιν εἰς τοῦτο ἄγονται τὸ ἀγαθὸν χρηστότητι τοῦ περιάγοντος, ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἄλλων ὄντως ἐγκαλοῦμενοι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ δίκαιον ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι, μηδὲ λοιδορούμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχὸς ἢ ὁ φονεὺς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Χριστιανοὶ πεφνυκότες. For τὸ read ὅτι. The ἧτοι before ἡμαρτηκότες suggests another alternative; and if we compare § 83 προσημαρτήσασιν φησι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ἐτέρῳ βίῳ τὴν κόλασιν ὑπομένειν ἐνταῦθα, τὴν μὲν ἐκλεκτὴν ἐπιτίμως διὰ μαρτυρίαν, and § 88 κολάζεσθαι μὲν τὸν μάρτυρα διὰ τὰς πρὸ τῆς ἐνσωματώσεως ἁμαρτίας, I think it will be seen that some such phrase as the following has been lost, <ἐν ἄλλῳ βίῳ ἢ ἐνταῦθα> ἐν ἄλλοις. Perhaps ὄντως may represent an obliterated ψευδομαρτυρούντων or διαβαλλόντων. I am disposed to think that the last clause read originally ὡς ὅτι μοιχὸς ἢ φονεὺς, ἀλλ' ὡς Χριστιανοί. If ὅτι had got corrupted to ὁ, a marginal correction might be thought to refer to the later ὡς. Just below put a full stop after δοκεῖν.

Ιβ. p. 600. πείσεται ὡς ἔπασχε καὶ τὸ νήπιον. Should we not read πάσχει? I see no reason for the imperfect.

§ 82, p. 600. ὡς οὖν τὸ νήπιον οὐ προσημαρτηκὸς ἢ ἐνεργῶς μὲν οὐχ ἡμαρτηκὸς οὐδὲν, ἐν ἑαυτῷ δὲ τὸ ἁμαρτήσαι ἔχον, ἐπὶ ὑποβληθῇ τῷ παθεῖν εὐεργετῆται τε πολλὰ κερδαίνον δύσκολα. For ἁμαρτήσαι read ἁμαρτηγόν, as we have just below ἔχον μὲν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ἁμαρτηγόν. Omit τε which is a mere dittography of -ται.

Ιβ. τὰ ὑτὸ ἐπαθεν ἐμφερῶς τῷ νηπιῷ. Read ταῦτα.

§ 84, p. 601. ἐρῶ τοῖνυν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κρατηθέντος ὁμολογήσῃ, πότερον μαρτυρήσει... ἢ οὐ. For ἐρῶ read ἐρωτῶ, the last syllable having been lost before the following τοι.

Ιβ. εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀποβάσεως καὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν κολασθῆναι τοῦτον φήσει τὴν ἀπώλειαν τῶν ἀρνησομένων ἐκ προνοίας ἁκίων προσμαρτηρήσει. C. is here arguing against the view of Basilides, that martyrdom is the providentially ordered punishment for ante-natal

sins. Martyrdom, he says, may be avoided by the denial of Christ: if such a result is providentially ordered, then Providence is responsible for the perdition of the renegades. The text is evidently incomplete: insert τῆσδε before τῆς, and τὴν πρόνοιαν αἰτίαν before τὴν ἀπώλειαν.

§ 85, p. 601. πειράζων γὰρ ὁ διάβολος εἰδὼς μὲν ὅτι ἔσμεν οὐκ εἰδὼς δὲ εἰ ὑπομενούμεν, ἀλλὰ ἀποσεῖσαι...βουλόμενος καὶ ὑπάγεσθαι ἑαυτῷ πειράζει. Transfer πειράζων and πειράζει. The former was probably changed in consequence of the preceding θειάζων. A little below put a full stop before ποῦ ἔτι ἡ πίστις;

§ 86, p. 601. εἰ δὲ...ἐν μέρος ἐκ τοῦ λεγομένου θελήματος τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπελήφμεν τὸ ἡγαπηκῆναι ἅπαντα...ἐτερον δὲ τὸ μηδενὸς ἐπιθυμεῖν, καὶ τρίτον μισεῖν μηδὲ ἐν, [θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ κολάσεις ἔσονται. It is difficult to see how the conclusion (that punishment is ordained by the will of God) can be derived from the preceding analysis of God's will into universal benevolence, absence of desire and absence of hate; indeed just below it is asserted that such a conclusion is impious. Perhaps we should put a mark of interrogation after ἔσονται, and transfer the words in square brackets to the end, inserting ἢ after μηδὲ ἐν.

§ 87, p. 602. (We must not suppose that God is himself the efficient cause of persecutions) ἀλλὰ μὴ κωλύειν τοὺς ἐνεργούντας...καταχρησθῆναι τε εἰς καλὸν τοῖς τῶν ἐναντίων τολμήμασιν. For τε read δέ. Just below in παιδευτικῆς τέχνης τῆς τοιαύτης αὐτῆς οὕτως προνοίας, read τοιαύτης for τοιαύτε αὐτῆς. The corruption originated no doubt in a super-scribed correction -ασδε.

§ 88, p. 602. ἡ πρόνοια δὲ εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος, ὡς φάναι, κινεῖσθαι ἀρχεται. Here ἄρχων is a technical term of the Gnostic theology (cf. *Str.* ii. p. 448), and we should probably read φασίν. [I.B. suggests φανερώς for ὡς φάναι.]

§ 89, p. 603. περὶ μὲν τούτων πολλὸς ὁ λόγος ὅσον ἐν ὑστέρῳ σκοπεῖν ἀποκρίσεται. For ὅσον read ὅν, the first syllable is merely a dittography of the preceding.

Ιβ. τὸ διάφορον γένος. Read διαφέρων as in § 91.

§ 90, p. 603. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ φαινόμενον αὐτὸ οὐ οὐκ ἔστιν ἢ ἐκ μεστότητος ψυχῇ ἔρχεται τὸ διαφέρον, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἐμφύσημα τοῦ διαφέροντος πνεύματος [καὶ καθ' ὅλον] ὃ ἐμπνέται τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ πνεύματος. For αὐτοῦ read αὐτό, transfer τὸ διαφέρον before τοῦ διαφέροντος, omit the following καὶ and the words in square brackets, which have slipped in from the καὶ καθόλου of the next

line. Translate 'since the merely apparent (i.e. the Demiurge in his first shadowy form, as described before, when he is as yet merely an unsubstantial image of the true God) does not really exist, the mediating soul comes, i.e. the excellent inbreathing of the excellent Spirit, which is breathed into the soul, the image of the Spirit.'

§ 91, p. 604. εἰ ἐπὶ τὸ καταλῦσαι θάνατον ἀφικνείται τὸ διαφέρον γένος, οὐχ ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν θάνατον κατήργησεν, εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς ὁμοούσιος λεχθείη, εἰ δ' εἰς τοῦτο κατήργησεν ὡς μὴ τοῦ διαφέροντος ἀπτεσθαι γένους, οὐχ οὔτοι τὸν θάνατον καταργοῦσιν. For τὸ read τῷ, for εἰς τοῦτο read εἰς τοῦτον, translating 'if the Elect come for the purpose of destroying death, Christ did not abolish death, unless he should be said himself to share the nature of the Elect; but if he by himself abolished death, without having (so as not to have) any part in the Elect, then death is not abolished by these.' Just below for κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δόγματος αἵρεσιν we should rather have expected κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς αἵρέσεως, but it may be enough to insert τοῦτον before τοῦ 'according to those who hold this dogma.'

Ib. εἰ ἡ δ' ἂν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἀμείνων τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ διαφιλονεικοίη καὶ ταῦτα ἐν θεοῖς. For εἰ ἡ δ' ἂν read εἰ δέ, and insert ἀλλὰ before οὐ γὰρ, translating 'even if the Lord is superior to the Creator, still there could be no rivalry between father and son, and that in the case of Divine Persons.'

§ 93, p. 605. τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν ἐνεργεῖα κείται οὐκ οὐσία. Insert ἐν before ἐνεργεῖα and οὐσία. The former would easily be lost and the latter would naturally follow it. [I.B. suggests ἐνέργεια and οὐσία.]

[§ 94, p. 605. κατὰ φυσικὴν τοίνυν ὀρεξίν χρηστὸν τοῖς<μὴ>κεκωλυμένοις καλῶς. I.B.]

§ 95, p. 606. τοὺς ὁμολογούντας μὲν ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοῦ διαβόλου καταγνομένους ἔργοις. Dindorf after Sylburg inserts ἐν before the former τοῖς, but this does not correspond with the following ἐν ἔργοις. If we omit τοῖς as having crept in from the following clause, we get a more satisfactory sense, 'those that profess themselves to be Christ's.'

§ 96, p. 606. τὰ ἐνισταῖτα ἐν οἷς ἐσμὲν κατὰ τὸν τοῦ βίου χρόνον ὡς τοῦ μὲν στρατιώτου ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ ἐμπόρου δὲ τὸ κέρδος. Perhaps λεία has been lost before ἐλπίς.

§ 97, p. 606. After quoting οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις C. continues εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ φασὶ τὴν περὶ τῶν εἰδωλοθῦτων γνῶσιν οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι φέρειν. A more suitable word would be ἐκφέρειν. [συνφέρειν. I.B.]

Ib. κὰν φάσκωσι 'πάν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἀγοράζειν δεῖ,' κατὰ πῦσιν ἐπάγοντες τὸ 'μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντας,' ἐπ' ἰσῆς τῷ <μὴ> ἀνακρίνοντας, γελοῖαν ἐξέγγισιν παραθήσονται. Dindorf after Potter inserts μὴ before the second ἀνακρίνοντας. A comparison with *Strom.* i. p. 370 will show that the MS. is right. There we have οὐχὶ ἐμώρηναν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου; ἐπ' ἰσῆς τῷ 'μωρὰν ἔδειξε.' So here, if μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντας forms part of an interrogative sentence 'are we to buy without asking questions?' it is equivalent to an imperative 'ask questions when you buy.'

Ib. (Buy freely from the shambles with the exception of) τῶν δηλουμένων κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν καθολικὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων πάντων σὺν τῇ εἰδοκίᾳ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος, τῇ γεγραμμένῃ μὲν ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων, διακομισθεῖσι δὲ εἰς τοὺς πιστοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ διακονούντος Παύλου. For the datives read accusatives agreeing with ἐπιστολῇ, comparing my note on *Str.* iii. 13 for a possible instance of a similar corruption.

Ib. p. 607. πάντα στέγομεν ἵνα μὴ ἐγκοπὴν δώμεν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἦτοι φορτία περιάγοντες δέον εὐλύτους εἰς πάντα εἶναι, ἡ ὑπόδειγμα τοῖς θέλονσιν ἐγκρατεῖσθαι γινόμενοι, μὴ οἰκοδομοῦμενοι εἰς τὸ ἀηδῶς τὰ παρατιθέμενα ἐσθίειν καὶ ὡς ἐτυχεν ὀμλεῖν τῇ γυναίκί, μάλιστα δὲ κ.τ.λ. This is a comment on St. Paul's words 'have we not authority to eat and to drink and to lead about a wife?' C. instances two ways of causing a stumbling-block, either by carrying about *impedimenta* (whereas the Christian soldier should be *expeditus*), or by countenancing those who were unwilling to deny themselves, and who would be thus trained (lit. 'being thus trained') to eat greedily what is served up and to put no check upon themselves in their intercourse with their wives. Put a comma after Χριστοῦ, and a full stop after γυναίκί. Read οἰκοδομούμενοις to agree with τοῖς θέλονσιν, remove the preceding μὴ and place it before θέλονσιν. Dindorf (following Lowth) places it before ἀηδῶς, but this is from failing to observe that οἰκοδομέω here has a bad sense, as just below, ἵνα μὴ κακῶς οἰκοδομηθῇ, and in 1 Cor. viii. 10 ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενεὺς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθνητα ἐσθίειν.

§ 98, p. 607. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ποιεῖτε εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ ποιεῖτε. ὅσα ὑπὸ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ποιεῖν ἐπιτέραπται. Sylburg (in his Index s.v. ὑπό) makes ὑπό dependent on ποιεῖν, translating *regulae subijcere*, but surely ποιεῖν must be interpreted by the pre-

ceding ποιείτε. Perhaps we should read τοῦ κανόνος.

§ 103, p. 609. After quoting from the list of O.T. worthies in Heb. xi. C. continues ὅτι μὲν οὖν μίαν σωτηρίαν λέγει ἐν Χριστῷ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἡμῶν σαφῶς μὲν εἰρηκεν πρότερον. For δικαίων read ἀρχαίων.

§ 110, p. 613. πλήθους ἐλέον περιέχεται τὸν ἐλπίζοντα...λέγει. Insert ὑπὸ before πλήθους. Dindorf follows Sylburg in reading πλήθος.

§ 112, p. 614. εἴπερ οὖν καὶ μισθῷ προσδοκώμεν ἐπικροτῶν τὰ χεῖλη εἰς μαρτυρίαν κυρίου ὁμολογήσω κύριον, κοινός εἰμι ἀνθρώπος, οὐ γινώσκων. Insert ἐπὶ before μισθῷ. The strange phrase ἐπικροτῶν χεῖλη is perhaps an allusion to χαλκὸς ἡχῶν of 1 Cor. xiii.

§ 114, p. 615. After quoting Matt. v. 28 C. continues οὐ ψλὴν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἡξίου κρίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐὰν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τὸ κατ' αὐτὴν ἔργον...ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἐκτελῇται ἥ γὰρ ὅναρ τῇ φαντασίᾳ συγκατάχρηται ἥ δ' ἡ καὶ τῷ σώματι. For ἥ read ἡ and transfer ἡδὴ and ἡ ('where passion rises to such a height'), it has already been affected by the imagination in dreams as though by the actual bodily presence.' Doubtless the corruption arose from a marginal correction, ἡδὴ being referred to the wrong ἡ. [A simpler and better emendation is that of I.B. reading ἡ for ἥ, as though it were ἡ ὅναρ τῇ φ. συγκαταχρωμένην συγκατάχρηται.]

§ 115, p. 615. προλαβούσης ὅναρ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας [τὴν παῖδα] παρ' ἐλπίδα κορισθεὶς ἤκουσαν τὴν ἐρωμένην κατὰ τὸ τεταγμένον εἰργεῖ τῆς εἰσόδου. The words in square brackets were probably lost from before τὴν ἐρωμένην, and being afterwards added in the margin, were inserted in their present position by one who was unfamiliar with the intransitive use of προλαβούσης.

§ 120, p. 618. φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὰς Ἀργολικὰς, ἡγουμένης αὐτῶν Τελεσίλλης...Σπαρτιάτας τοὺς ἀλκίμους τὰ πολέμια φανείσας μόνον τρέφασθαι καὶ ἐκείναις τὸ ἀδεῖς τοῦ θανάτου περιποιήσασθαι. For ἐκείναις read αὐταῖς. Potter would insert αὐτήν, but would not this require the active περιποιῆσαι?

§ 124, p. 620. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα εἵργειν δύνανται τις προσπολεμῶν, τὸ δ' ἐφ' ἡμῶν οὐδαμῶς, οὐδ' ἂν μάλιστα ἐνίσταται. For ἂν read εἰ. Possibly we should read δύναται ἂν for δύναται before.

§ 137, p. 626. κἂν πως ἀγαθουργοῦντι αὐτῷ ἐναντίον τι ἀπαντήσῃ, ὥς ἀγαθὴν τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἀμνηστικῶς προήσεται. For ἀγαθὴν, which has perhaps slipped in from the preceding ἀγαθουργοῦντι, read ἀπαγορευμένην. Dindorf follows Lowth in prefixing οὐκ to ἀγαθὴν.

§ 138, p. 627. After describing the perfect Christian as οὐκ ἐγκρατὴς ἐτι ἀλλ' ἐν ἑξεί ἀπαθείας, 'participant of the divine nature,' C. goes on to say ἐπὶ δὲ ἐν ἑξεί ποιήσῃ τὸ εὐεργετικόν, φύσιν ἀγαθοῦ μιμήσεται...οὐ δὲ δι' [ἀρθένας μετατεθῆναι, ἀλλὰ] βαδίζοντας ἀφικέσθαι οἱ δέ. [τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐλκυσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς] διὰ πάσης τῆς στενῆς διελθόντας ὁδοῦ, τὸ ἀξίον γενέσθαι τὴν δύναμιν τῆς χάριτος παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λαβεῖν ἀκολύτως ἀναδραμεῖν. The ideas do not hang well together. Potter noticed that διὰ πάσης τῆς στενῆς...ὁδοῦ was unsuited to ἐλκυσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς and must be joined to the previous clause βαδίζοντας κ.τ.λ. On the other hand the last clause, as well as ἐλκυσθῆναι, would agree well with the expression ἀρθένας μετατεθῆναι, the whole being descriptive of the new nature of the perfect Christian as opposed to the lower state of the ἐγκρατὴς described in the phrases already noticed. I think therefore we should read οὐ δὲ διὰ βαδίζοντας ἀφικέσθαι οἱ δέ διὰ πάσης τῆς στενῆς διελθόντας ὁδοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀρθένας μετατεθῆναι τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ ἐλκυσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ ἀξίον...ἀναδραμεῖν, translating 'the journey to our goal is not all on foot through the narrow way; we must be lifted up and translated. For this is the being drawn by the Father, viz. the being made worthy to receive from God the power of his grace to run upwards without hindrance.' Compare Potter's note on ἀπάθεια Paed. i. p. 99.

§ 142, p. 628. καὶ δὴ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἶη ἂν καὶ ἡ ἐκ Μωϋσέως παραδεδομένη τοῖς ποιηταῖς ὡδὲ πως. Omit ἡ (often confused with καί, see my n. on i. 7, p. 319) before εἰκὼν and before ἐκ.

§ 145, p. 629. καὶ ὅ γε Ἐπίκουρος ἀδικεῖν ἐπὶ κέρδει τινὶ βούλεσθαι φησι τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν σοφόν· πίστιν γὰρ λαβεῖν περὶ τοῦ λαθεῖν οὐ δύνασθαι. Insert οὐ before φησι, otherwise the succeeding clause would have been connected by ἀλλὰ instead of γάρ. [Here I am anticipated by I.B.]

§ 145, p. 630. ἐλπίς δὲ ὁ μὲν ὕμῳ καὶ ἡ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀπόδοσις τε καὶ ἀποκατάστασις. Read ὁ μόνυμος: 'Hope is here equivalent to the restoration and regeneration hoped for.'

§ 147, p. 631. τοῖς δὲ ἐξωθεν εὐχρήστοις ἡ δυσχρήστοις προσαγομένοις τῶν μὲν ἀπέχονται, τῶν δ' οὐ. Perhaps προσφερόμενοι may have been lost after προσαγομένοις. [I.B. would read simply προσαγομένοι.]

[Ib. μυσταττομενοι, ταῦτα. Put the comma after ταῦτα. I.B.]

Ib. κἂν τῷ δοκεῖν πιστῶς ἀναστρέφονται τὴν κρίσιν ἔχουσιν ἀνόσιον. This clause should be preceded and followed by a full stop.

§ 150, p. 632. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄνθρωπος ἀπλῶς οὐτὸς κατ' ἰδέαν πλάσσεται...ὁ δὲ τις ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τύπωσιν. For οὗτος read οὕτως.

§ 151, p. 632. οὐ ταύτη ἀφοβος (ὁ θεός) ἢ τὰ δεινὰ ἐκκλίνει...οὔτε γὰρ ἂν περιπέσοι τινὶ δεινῷ ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσιν, οὔτε φεύγει ὁ θεός δειλίαν. Insert with Potter οὐκ before ἐκκλίνει, and change φεύγει into φεύγοι, and δειλίαν into δειλία.

§ 153, p. 633. αὐτίκα τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐστὶν οὐπὲρ ἐπ' ἴσης αὐτοῦ τε κύριοι ἔσμεν καὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου αὐτῷ, ὡς τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν ἢ μὴ, καὶ τὸ πιστεύειν ἢ ἀπιστεῖν. Read τοῦ for τὸ before φιλοσοφεῖν and πιστεύειν.

Ib. οἱ τ' αὖ κολαζόμενοι ἕνεκεν τῶν γενομένων αὐτοῖς ἁμαρτημάτων ἐπ' αὐτοῖς μόνοις κολάζονται, παρήλθε γὰρ τὰ γινόμενα...ἀφίενται γοῦν πρὸς τοῦ κυρίου αἱ πρὸ τῆς πίστεως, οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ὥσι γινόμεναι ἀλλ' ὡς μὴ γινόμεναι. Perhaps we should insert ἁμαρτίαι after πίστεως, unless there is some corruption in the ἁμαρτημάτων and αὐτοῖς μόνοις of the preceding sentence.

§ 154, p. 634. πρῶτον μὲν ἴν' αὐτὸς ἀμείνων αὐτοῦ γένηται ὁ παιδευόμενος, εἰς ἐπειτα ὅπως κ.τ.λ. Omit εἰς before ἐπειτα, as a dittography of the preceding -ος. For a similar corruption cf. my note on iii. p. 514. [I.B. supposes something to be lost between εἰς and ἐπειτα.]

§ 155, p. 634. εἰκότως οὖν καὶ Πλάτων τὸν τῶν ιδεῶν θεωρητικὸν θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ζήσεσθαι φησι, νοῦς δὲ χώρα ιδεῶν, νοῦς δὲ ὁ θεός. τὸν ἀοράτον θεὸν θεωρητικὸν θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ζῶντα εἴρηκεν. Perhaps we should change the first δὲ into γὰρ and φησι into φήσας, making the following clause (νοῦς...θεός) a parenthesis, with a comma after θεός. τοῦ has probably been lost before ἀοράτου.

Ib. ὅταν γὰρ ψυχὴ γενέσῃς ὑπεξαναβάσας καθ' ἑαυτὴν γε ἢ καὶ ὁμιλῇ τοῖς εἰδεσιν...οἷον ἄγγελος ἤδη γενομένος σὺν Χριστῷ τε ἔσται θεωρητικὸς ὢν, κ.τ.λ. For γε read τε, which has been wrongly inserted after Χριστῷ.

§ 157, p. 635. πᾶς υἱὸς ἀλλογενὴς ἀπερίτμητος καρδία καὶ ἀπερίτμητός ἐστι σαρκί, τοιούστιν ἀκάθαρτος σώματι καὶ πνεύματι, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια. Omit ἐστι, as in the original (Ezek. xlv. 9). It was doubtless the insertion of a scribe who did not understand that the verb εἰσελεύσεται belonged to υἱός.

§ 158, p. 635. (Of the tribes of Israel those were accounted the holiest) αἱ εἰς ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ προφῆτας χρίοντο. As we are not told of any tribe which had the right to anoint, except the tribe to which the high priest belonged, Lowth suggests that we should read χρισθῆναι, which would then apply to the priestly and the royal

tribes; but there will still remain a difficulty, as the prophets were not confined to any tribe (cf. v. § 41, p. 670).

§ 159, p. 636. After speaking (in reference to Ezek. xlv. 26, 27) of a purification (καθαρίζεσθαι) which lasts seven days, and a propitiatory sacrifice (ἱλασμόν) on the eighth day, C. continues τέλειος δ' οἶμαι καθαρισμός ἢ διὰ νόμον καὶ προφητῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πίστις ἰλεως καὶ ἡ δι' ὑπακοῆς πάσης ἀγνεία σὺν καὶ τῇ ἀποθέσει τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀπολαύσεως τῆς ψυχῆς εὐχάριστον τοῦ σκῆνους ἀπόδοσιν. Put a colon after πίστις and read ἱλασμός δὲ for ἱλεως καὶ, and ἀπολύσεως for ἀπολαύσεως, comparing Arist. Resp. 17, 8 ἀναίσθητος ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπόλυνσις (ἐν γῆρᾳ). In the perplexing sentence which follows, it seems to me that the words ἐπὶ γὰρ τροπῆς εὐλάβεια καὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης ἁπτεται περιφορᾶς should be removed from the end of the § and placed after εἴτε καὶ ἡ ἀπλανὴς χώρα ἢ πλησιάζουσα τῷ νοητῷ κόσμῳ ὀγδοῦς λέγοιτο: the eighth sphere (that of the fixed stars) is in close proximity to the furthest planetary sphere, and therefore not entirely removed from fear of change.

§ 160, p. 636. The just man will depart from this world γυμνός...ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ ἐπομένου τοῖς ἀδίκως βιώσασιν ἀειδοῦς εἰδῶλον. The allusion, as Potter has pointed out, is to the *Phaedo* 81, where it is said of the sin-polluted soul that it still retains something of an earthly and corporeal nature on its separation from the body, and hence continues as a visible ghost to haunt the tomb where the body lies: it is only the pure soul which is ἀειδής. Read therefore γεωδοῦς for ἀειδοῦς and put a full stop after εἰδῶλον. In the next sentence τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τὸ εἰρημένον 'ἐν μὴ στραφέντες γένησθε ὡς τὰ παῖδια, καθαροὶ μὲν...ἄγιοι δὲ...δεῖκνύντες ὅτι τοιοῦτους ἡμᾶς εἶναι βούλεται, for δεκνύντες, which was naturally assimilated to καθαροί, read δεκνὺν agreeing with τὸ εἰρημένον.

§ 161, p. 637. μὴ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν θατέρῳ. Omit ἐν, as caused by dittography, and read θατέρου 'not to take advantage of his neighbour.'

§ 162, p. 638. ὁ θεός δὲ ἀναρχος ἀρχὴ τῶν ὄλων παντελὴς ἀρχῆς ποιητικός. ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν οὐσία ἀρχὴ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ τύπου, καθόσον ἐστὶν τὰγαθὸν τοῦ ἡθικοῦ, ἢ δ' αὖ ἐστὶ νοῦς τοῦ λογικοῦ καὶ κριτικοῦ τύπου. Put a comma after ὄλων and read παντελῶς. For ποιητικῷ, which has slipped in from the preceding ποιητικός, read φυσικοῦ (with I.B. in *J. of Phil.*) and add δὲ after καθόσον.

§ 165, p. 639. αἱ ἀγαθαὶ πράξεις ὡς ἀμείνων τῷ κρείττονι τῷ πνεύματι κυρίῳ προσάπτονται, αἱ δὲ φιλήδονοι...τῷ ἥττονι τῷ ἁμαρτη

τικῶ. For πνευματι κυρίῳ read πνευματικῶ, the last syllable having been wrongly expanded by the scribe; compare my note on ii. 89.

§ 166, p. 639. ἐπιμελούμενος καὶ κοσμοκικῶν τὸν τόπον ἔνθα καταλύει. Read κοσμῶν.

§ 169, p. 641. τὴν σύνεσιν ἀκοὴν εἰπὼν καὶ οὐρανὸν τὴν τοῦ γνωστικοῦ ψυχὴν, τὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν θεῶν θεὰν ἐπανηρημένον, καὶ ταύτῃ Ἰσραηλίτην γεγενῆσθαι ἔμπαλιν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐλόμενον τὴν ἀμαθίαν... γῆν εἶρηκεν. Insert ἐλόμενον before γεγενῆσθαι and read αὐτὸν for αὐτόν.

§ 171, p. 641. τί...βουλόμενοι μετὰ φωνῆς εὔχεσθαι κελεύουσιν;...ὅτι δικαίως ἐβούλοντο εἶναι τὰς εὐχὰς ἃς οὐκ ἂν τις αἰδεσθεῖη ποιῆσθαι πολλῶν συνειδότων. I think we should either change ἐβούλοντο to ἡγοῦντο or ἃς into οἷας.

§ 172, p. 642. ἐγὼ δὲ ἂν εὐξαίμην τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ περῶσαι με εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν ἐμὴν. For ἐμὴν read καυὴν, the first syllable of which in its contracted form was liable to be changed into ε.

J. B. MAYOR.

SOME EMENDATIONS OF THE GREEK TRAGICI.

Soph. fr. 179 Nauck².

γυναικα δ' ἐξελόντες ἢ θράσσει γένν
τε ως του μεν ἔωλον γραφίδις ἐνημμένοις.

Perhaps ὁστοῦν θ' ἔωλον γραφίδις ἐνεμμένοις. A description of a woman picking her teeth with a stylus: *quae turbat maxillam dentemque hesterno cibo fartum stylis insertis*.

Soph. fr. 215.

Is not ὑποφρος a mistake for ὑπόφορος? The substantive ὑποφορά was used in the sense of a hollow passage or pipe, and then, medically, of a fistula: ὑπόφορος as an adjective had a similar meaning. This would explain Erotianus' ὑποφρον κρυφαῖον, and the scansion would be possible in the corrupt verse cited by him from Sophocles' *Erigone* νῦν δ' εἰρήν ὑποφρος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔως Ἀπώλυσεν τε καὶ τὸς ἐξαπώλετο. It would also suit the passage cited by Erotianus from Hippocrates ὑποφρον καὶ ἔχον περὶ αὐτὸ θαλάμης.

Eurip. fr. 303.

ὁ γὰρ οὐδενὸς ἐκφύς
χρόνος δικαίους ἐπάγων κανόνας
δείκνυσιν ἀνθρώπων κακότητος ἐμοί.

Dr. Blaydes (*Adversaria in Tragic. Graec. Fragm.* p. 318) writes 'hoc non intelligo.' I think the meaning is: Time existing from the immemorial past brings up rules of right and wrong which act as tests by which I am able to distinguish bad men from good.

901 Eurip. fr. 401, 3-5.

παρά τ' ἐλπίδα καὶ παρά δίκαν
τοὺς μὲν ἀπ' οἰκῶν δ' ἐναπίπτοντας

5 ἀτὰρ θεοῦ, τοὺς δ' εὐτυχοῦντας ἄγει.

παρὰ δόξαν is an old and very probable emendation of παρὰ δίκαν. For οἰκῶν δ' ἐναπίπτοντας I suggest δὴν πίπτοντας. The

metre of 5 is uncertain, but ἄτερ θεοῦ 'abandoned by the god' and ἄσει are plausible corrections.

Neophron fr. 3.

τέλος γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐχθίστῳ μὶρῳ φέρεις
βροχωτὸν ἀγχόνην ἐπισπᾶσας δέρη.

αὐτὸν ἐχθίστῳ, αὐτεχθίστῳ are mentioned as variants. In this variation I trace a combination of αὐτὸς αὐτόν, and would write the passage thus:

τέλος γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτόν ἐχθίστῳ μὶρῳ
φθερεῖς βροχωτὸν ἀγχόνην ἐπισπᾶσας,

omitting δέρη as a gloss. φθερεῖς is Elmsley's conjecture. It is also possible that ἐπὶ should be deleted, and σπᾶσας δέρη written.

Achaeus 9.

(A.) Μῶν Ἀχελῶος (Blaydes Ἀχελῶος) ἦν
κεκραμένους πολὺν;

(B.) Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ λείξει τῷδε (Blaydes τῷδε) τῷ
γένει θέμης.

(A.) καλῶς μὲν οὖν ἄγειν σκύθη πειν.

Possibly καλῶς μὲν οὖν ἀστέιον ὡς Σκύθη πειν. as ἀναγήσαντα in fr. 20 is written for ἀναστήσαντα. 'Immo pulcre urbanum erat, utpote Scythae, sic bibere aquam mixtam uino.' A Scythian drunkard would mix no water, but take his liquor neat.

Achaeus fr. 19.

τὸν Σπαρτιάτην γραπτὸν κύρβιν ἐν διπλῷ ξύλῳ.

Read γραπτόκυρβιν ἐν διπλῷ | ξύλῳ.

Chaeremon fr. 10.

ἐνθ' αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀπείρονα στρατὸν
ἀνθρώπων ἀλογχὸν ἐστράτευσαν ἡδοναῖς
θρησκόμεναι...οντα λευκῶν τέκνα.

Possibly βρύοντα which is often constructed with a dative.

Chaeremon fr. 12.

πολλὴν ὄψωρον Κύπριδος εἰσορᾶν παρὴν
ἄκρασι περκαζούσαν οἰνάνθαις † χρόνον.

It is usual to consider χρόνον corrupt, and Meineke's δμοῦ has found many believers. Of these I am not one, and even doubt whether χρόνον may not be defended. Chaeremon is one of the most artificial poets of the later kind of tragedy, meant like *Philip van Artevelde*, and *Bothwell*, not for acting, but reading. The poet, speaking of maidens in the maturity of their charms, describes them as fruit darkening with the perfect vine-blossoms of time, i.e. with the hue or tinge that maturity brings to female beauty. Such language belongs to a late stage of poetry, and may be compared with Propertius' *mortis lacrimis*, tears of death=our tears when dead, or tears after death.

Chaeremon 13.

κόμαισιν ὥρων σώματ' εὐανθή ῥόδα
εἶχον, τιθήνημ' ἔαρος ἐκπεπέστατον.

σώματ' is, I think, wrong, and I doubt its being a corruption of στέμματ'. It is more likely to stand for χρώματ', a word and idea of which Chaeremon is particularly fond. Roses are called the season's diverse hues, because their colours vary with the successive times at which they flower. Or ὥρων may be personal, the Hours; roses,

which are the hues that deck the Hours in successively changing tints.

Carcinus *fr.* 8.

ἐν δρᾷ μόνον ἴδιον (*al.* ἡδίων) ὦν ποιεῖ φθόνος.
λυπεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ κτήμα τοὺς κεκτημένους.

Porson corrected ἴδιον to δίκαιον. It might be, I think, σπονδαῖον. Then, λυπεῖ γὰρ οὖν τὸ κτήμα.

Python *fr.* 1.

ἐστὶν δ' ὅπον μὲν ὁ κάλαμος πέφυχ' ὅδε
† φέτωμ' ἄορνον.

Possibly πτέρωμ' 'a wing—but not of birds,' i.e. a building.

Sosiphanes *fr.* 1.

μάγους ἐπωδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη
ψευδὴς σελήνης αἰθέρος καταβατίς.

Perhaps ψεύδει σελήνην αἰθέρος καταβατίν.
Sositheus 2.

τῇ μᾶ δ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ

δαινύσι τ' ἔμπης συντίθηναι εἰς τέλος.

Possibly δαινὺς ἐπ' ὅμπην συντίθης' οἶνον γάνος.

Adespot. 458.

αἰὲ δ' ὀρώντί τ' ὀξὺ καὶ τυφλὸς ἦν.

This should be, I imagine,

αἰὲ δ' ὀρών τις ὀξὺ καὶ τυφλὸς περ ἦν.

'He (Oedipus) ever had a kind of sharp sight even in his blindness.'

ROBINSON ELLIS.

NOTES ON THE Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων.

15 § 1. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον
ἔτει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῃ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον—οὐ γὰρ
πολὺν χρόνον κατέλχεν.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf is unquestionably right in his judgment that the text is corrupt. The statement is that the duration of the second ἀρχή of Pisistratus was six years—a year longer than the first ἀρχή, and little or not at all shorter than, on this supposition, the third ἀρχή must have been [17-(6+5)=6]. If so, οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον is simply nonsense. Wilamowitz hesitatingly proposes τρίτῳ; but the change of the numeral is, as he confesses, arbitrary, and there is no palaeographical motive. Besides, even two years is too long. Herodotus in his account (i. 61) gives no definite note of time, but the whole impression of his narrative is that the retirement of Pisistratus followed hard upon his restoration, certainly well within the space of a year. And the phrase οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον leads us to expect here a statement confirming the impression we had before received from the dateless record of

Herodotus. We expect to read: 'In the twelfth year after he first seized the tyranny, he was restored...Then when he went into exile a second time, in the twelfth year after he seized the tyranny'—'Oh, but,'—objects the reader—'that was the year in which he was restored.' 'Certainly,' replies Aristotle, 'but he was only in power a short time.' That is what γάρ (in the light of the Herodotean passage) seems to imply.

And so, I believe, Aristotle wrote, though he expressed it somewhat differently. The difficulty in the text is due to the presence of an explanatory interpolation. We meet in the case of the immediately preceding date (14 § 4) a clear instance of such interpolation. There a scribe, not understanding that ἔτει δωδεκάτῳ referred to the starting-point of the πρώτη κατάστασις, introduced the erroneously explicit μετὰ ταῦτα and so wrought confusion in the sense. So here. Aristotle wrote: 'when he was expelled for the second time in the seventh year (after his first exile)—(the year of his restoration?—certainly) for he held the power for only

a short time.' The copyist, not seeing that the 'seventh year' was the same as the preceding 'twelfth year,' reckoned from a different starting-point, introduced *μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον* to render explicit what was not quite clearly stated. So we should read:

ὥς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον ἔτει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ,
—οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατείχεν.

Thus we obtain the following dates:

First ἀρχή: 5 years (561/0—556/5).

Second ἀρχή: part of a year (550/49).

Third ἀρχή: 12 years (540/39—528/7).

First exile: 6 years (556/5—550/49).

Second exile: 10 years (550/49—540/39).

Total: 33 and part of a year (561/0—528/7).

It is easily seen that, on this plan of reckoning, the total period of ἀρχή might be variously reckoned at (a) seventeen and a fraction or roughly seventeen, and (b), by counting the first and the third ἀρχή as having lasted each for some months beyond the round number of years, at nineteen. (a) is represented by the passage in the *Politics*, viii. 1350b; and also results if we subtract the sixteen years of exile from thirty-three; (b) is adopted in 17 § 1.

22 § 2. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἐφ' Ἑρμοκρέοντος ἀρχοντος τῇ βουλῇ τοῖς πεντακοσίοις τὸν ὄρκον ἐποίσαν... ἔπειτα τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἡρῶντο... ἔτει δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ νικῆσαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην κ.τ.λ.

There is not necessarily a chronological mistake here. The date of Hermocreon's archonship (504—503) only concerns the introduction of the Oath for the Five Hundred. Subsequently the ordinance for the election of the strategoi was passed, namely in 501—500, the twelfth year before Marathon (490—489). The passage is usually interpreted as if it were ἔτει δὲ πέμπτῳ... ἀρχοντος πρῶτον μὲν τῇ βουλῇ... ἔπειτα δέ...; which would imply an inconsistency.¹ The only difficulty is the discrepancy between Aristotle and Dionysius, who gives Akestorides as the archon of 504—3 (v. 37).

26 § 1. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους συνέπεσε μὴδ' ἡγεμόνα ἔχιν τοὺς ἐπικειστέροους

¹ On that supposition the best correction would be (not to stir πέμπτῳ but) to alter ἔπειτα to ἔπειτα <δ' ἔτει ᾗ>—the eighth year μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν

ἀλλ' αὐτῶν προστάται Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου νεώτερον† ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα.

For the genuineness of the suspicious word Mr. Walker (*Class. Rev.* vi. 98) has made the best case that can be made, maintaining that in estimating the chronological difficulty we must not go by the received dates of this period, but must first draw the conclusions which are implied by the supposed presence of Themistocles at Athens in 462. But even if we granted—that we need not grant—that Aristotle altered his chronological view of the period so as to harmonize with this anecdote, we should not get rid of the objections. For there is something very suspicious, as Mr. Sandys rightly pointed out, in the combination νεώτερον καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff hardly goes too far in calling it 'unsinn.' He supports the emendation νεωρότερον with great ability (*Aristoteles und Athen* ii. 136), though he admits that it is 'ein grobes Wort und von dem Euphemismus der attischen Eleganz weit entfernt.' The reference to *Rhetoric* ii. 1390b will persuade many; and perhaps rightly. But the correction is not so certain that it may not be worth while to put forward another conjecture which is palaeographically easier and gives equally good sense. The author evidently means to say that Cimon had no political shrewdness or tact, and this natural lack was not in any measure compensated for by sheer dint of political experience. He was devoid of that σύνεσις which marked, for instance, Themenes. I therefore propose:

ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΟΥ ΑCYNΕΤΩΤΕΡΟΝ

i.e. Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου ἀσυνετώτερον ὄντα.

The resemblance of the first letters of the word ACY to the last letters of the foregoing word, ΔΟΥ, misled the scribe into omitting them; and the surviving *νοα nihili νεωτερον* could become nothing but νεώτερον.

30 § 3, 4. καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλευεῖν δὲ ᾗ ἂν δοκῇ αὐτοῖς ἀρίστα εἶεν κ.τ.λ.

It is recognized that a sentence ends at βουλευεῖν, and that an infinitive has fallen out before δέ. βουλευεσθαι is adopted by Blass and Mr. Sandys, but does not account for its own omission. Read:

βουλ εὐείν. <κελ εὐείν> δὲ ᾗ ἂν κ.τ.λ.

The change of ᾗ to ᾗ̃ was a consequence of the omission of κελεῖν.

33 *ad fin.* πολέμου τε καθεστῶτος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς πολιτείας οὐσης.

It is remarkable that the particle γε does not occur in the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Is it possible that we may have it here? πολέμου γε καθεστῶτος would be an improvement ('considering that there was war'), and would suggest the sense desired by Herwerden who proposed καίπερ πολέμου.

35 § 2. καὶ τοὺς τ' Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθέλλον ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητήσεις εἶχον καὶ τὸ κύρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κατέλυσαν ὡς ἐπανορθούντες καὶ ποιοῦντες ἀναμφισβήτητον τὴν πολιτείαν.

Two distinct attacks were made on the Areopagus, the first by Ephialtes, the second by Pericles. There is now no justification for Sauppe's rejection of the words καὶ Περικλῆς in Arist. *Pol.* ii. 12 (1274a): καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς. The notice in our treatise, 27 § 1, τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἐνια παρείλετο saves, beyond dispute, the suspected words. But it is to be observed how the misinterpretation of such a phrase led to the false notion, found in Plutarch, that Pericles was the real mover in the attack which was headed by Ephialtes. The reform of Ephialtes was previous to the prominent appearance of Pericles on the political stage; but it is not unlikely that when Pericles resolved to 'dock' some of the few privileges which Ephialtes had left to the Areopagites, he did not make the motion himself but got another to make it for him. This is the only supposition on which we can explain the words in 35 § 2. What, we are entitled to ask, did they leave unstirred the well-known laws in which Pericles carried on the policy begun

by Ephialtes, and only remove those of the obscure Archestratus of whom or of whose laws we never hear elsewhere? The conclusion seems unavoidable that Archestratus was the instrument of Pericles, and that he is here mentioned because the laws were in his name.

But the sentence requires a slight emendation. According to the text of the papyrus τοὺς τ' corresponds to καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος κ.τ.λ. But it is clear that καθέλλον refers only to the Areopagitic laws, not to the Solonian which were preserved in the Prytaneum; and τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν cannot be separated from καὶ τὸ κύρος, both depending on κατέλυσαν. It has been suggested that τ' should be omitted: but why should it have been inserted? The true restoration is

καὶ <τοὺς> Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους

47 § 5. εἰσφέρεται μὲν οὖν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν τὰ γραμματ[εῖα τὰ] τὰς καταβολὰς ἀναγεγραμμένα.

So Kaibel and Wilamowitz. But κ stands before τὰς in the papyrus. Read perhaps:

τὰ γραμματεῖα τὰ πεντεκαῖδεκα.

1Ε (as often 1C) might have become Κ. Fifteen γραμματεῖα have been mentioned: ten containing the instalments paid in each prytany; three for those paid three times a year; one for those paid in the ninth prytany; and one, in the case of the Basileus, specially reserved for the revenue arising from τεμῖνη (ἐν γραμματείοις λελευκωμένοις does not mean that he used more than one at a time).

J. B. BURY.

ON TIBULLUS I. 1, 2.

et teneat culti iugera multa soli.

In the *Classical Review*, May, 1894, p. 198, the reading *magna* is defended by F. K. Ball, with comparison especially of Ov. *Amor.* 3, 15, 12, and Statius, *Theb.* 5, 550.

1. The MSS. read as follows: *magna*, AVg; *multa*, G, Par. Fris. Diomedes (the MS. testimony is reversed in the note above mentioned); and the combination of both the excerpts with Diomedes is here on the whole to be preferred to AV.

2. *Iugera* occurs but four times in the Tibullus collection, as follows: (a) i. 1, 2 (this passage). (b) ii. 3, 42: *multa innumera iugera*. (c) iii. 3, 5: *multa iugera*. (d) i. 3, 75: *novem per iugera*. In these other cases the text is not in dispute, save that Baehrens characteristically wishes to change the *multa* at ii. 3, 42 to *culta*! *Multa* is therefore rather strikingly in harmony with the usage of Tibullus.

3. Similar are: Ov. *Fast.* iii. 192: *iugera pauca soli*; ex Pont. iv. 9, 86: *iugera multa*

reti; Verg. *Georg.* iv. 127: *pauca relictis iugera ruris*; Juv. 9, 60: *iugeribus paucis*.

4. *Multa* is quite in harmony also with the spirit of this first elegy, in which the poet so often suggests that, while he once possessed many acres, he now has but few; cf. vv. 5, 19—20, 37, 41.

5. The whole passage in Ovid (*Amor.* 3, 15, 11—14) reads:

*Atque aliquis spectans hospes Sulmonis aquosi
moenia quae campi iugera pauca tenent,
quae tantum dicat potuistis ferre poetam,
quantulacumque estis, vos ego magna voco.*

(a) The two most important Ovid MSS. (the two Paris MSS.) are not available on this passage.

(b) To back up *parva* here, as K. P. Schulze does, by referring to Hor. *Sat.* 1, 6, 7 (*Olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent*) is idle. For (1) *legionibus* here refers to troops of the Etruscans, who had no Roman 'legiones'; and (2) *legionibus* here naturally = *exercitibus*, a usage sanctioned by the highest authorities of the Augustan age (as well as other periods), e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9, 368: *cetera dum legio campis instructa tenetur*; *Aen.* 8, 605: *de colle videri poterat legio*; &c.

(c) *Parva* would seem too strong an expression here; for while *pauca* might be accepted as poetic hyperbole, *parva* would appear to carry with it an almost contemptuous seriousness which Ovid would scarcely apply to Sulmo, especially since it is far

from true that the plain of Sulmo was a narrow one.

(d) The *parva* might easily have been interpolated by a misunderstanding of the passage arising out of a confusion of *iugera* with *moenia*, in accordance with which the interpolator might have thought he was properly contrasting *parva* with the *magna* of v. 14.

6. The passage in Statius, *Theb.* 5, 550 (*spatiosaue iugera complet*) is an outrageous hyperbole, as it refers to the size of the dragon that had just killed the child Archemorus. It may be explained as a hypallage for *spatia iugeralia*; i.e. the dragon is said to be stretched out over a space as big as acres. It does not therefore seem a fair parallel to the serious expressions *magna iugera* and *parva iugera*.

7. The 'magna' in our Tibullus passage may have arisen from some copyist's over-sensitive ear to assonance, *iugera magna* being easier to write from dictation than *iugera multa*.

8. It seems doubtful, therefore, whether any Latin parallel to the English idiom, 'broad acres,' exists. If one had been in vogue, would 'magna' have been the adjective? or something like *patentia* or *diffusa*?

KARL P. HARRINGTON.

University of North Carolina.

SUETONIUS, NERO, 45.

Alterius [statuae] collo ascopera deligata simulque titulus: Ego quid potui? sed tu culleum meruisti.

THE above is the reading of all the editions. *Ascopera* is a conjecture of Poliziano, for which *ascopa* is found in all MSS. The passage describes an incident at the end of Nero's reign, when derisive mottoes were attached to his statues or written up elsewhere. The words *ego quid potui* have puzzled the editors. One interpretation is 'Ego quid potui (sc. peccare)?' Baumgarten-Crusius in a long note says that the *ascopera* attached to the neck of the statue signified, 'abeundum iam esse in exilium et miseriam Neroni,' and he goes on to explain the words put into the mouth of the *ascopera*; 'Ego cui nulla potestas in civitate sed iustum de te iudicium quid

potui nisi hoc? sed tu, si leges valent, ut matricida culeum meruisti.'

Neither of these interpretations carries conviction. The latter evidently adopts the gloss of Suidas: Ἀσκοπήρα τὸ μαρσπιον ἦτοι τὸ σακκοπύθιον (wallet, knapsack) and throws emphasis on the latter part of the compound—πήρα. There appears to be no authority for this meaning except Suidas. A similar gloss is found in Ducange (*Gloss. m. et i. Lat.*) s.v. ASCOPERA idem quod *ascopa*, marsupium. But he gives a quotation from a Chronicle of the tenth century: Cum sciret non nisi in *ascopera* nisi modicae quantitatis vinum haberi, where a. obviously means ἀσρός, uter. And Lewis and Short quote from the Vulgate, Judith 10, 5: Imposuit itaque abrae suae *ascoperam* (v.l. *ascopam*, LXX. ἀσκοπύθιον) vini.

This is satisfactory evidence that in later Latin *ascopera* was used of a receptacle for liquids like the simple ἀσκόζ. If the usage may be assumed to reach back to Suetonius' time we can get a much more pointed meaning out of the words by punctuating: *Ego quid? potui; tu autem culleum meruisti—*

where *potui* is the dative expressing the purpose, 'the predicative dative,' and the meaning is: 'What am I? A sack to drink from. But you have deserved a sack of another kind.' The allusion is of course to the well-known punishment of matricides.

W. CHAWNER.

NOTE ON HOR. OD. IV. ii. 49.

It may seem rash to attempt to emend an author like Horace, who is so much read, and has had so many editors; and it may be thought presumptuous to meddle with a passage on which so many well-known scholars have spent their efforts; still the emendation which I have to propose is at once so simple and so probable that I can think of no reason why it should have escaped so many generations of editors.

The traditional reading of the best MSS.

teque dum procedit, io triumphe!
non semel dicemus, io triumphe!

and this Hirschfelder (4th ed. of Orelli) retains, finding none of the emendations yet suggested an improvement on the MSS.

With this reading Triumphus is personified (as it is taken in *Epodes* ix. 21) and *procedit* refers to Augustus. But it should be noted that throughout the poem the second person refers to Iulus as in verses 2, 33, 41, and again in v. 53, the first line of the following stanza. The variant *procedis* does not eliminate the difficulty of the passage, whether the 2nd person is under-

stood to refer to Augustus or to the personified Triumphus.

'*Procedit*' should clearly be kept, from MSS. evidence as well as from intrinsic probability; and the word can only refer to the 'triumphator.' The next step is to get rid of the pronoun: editors who have done this are Meineke and Bentley; but the former's 'atque' is as prosaic as the latter's 'isque' is weak and un-Horatian: nor can one see how the reading 'te,' which has the consensus of the MSS., could have arisen from either of them.

I propose to read '*terque*': 'and we, as Caesar doth advance, the citizens, not once alone will raise the cry "Io Triumphe!" but thrice "Io triumphe!"' etc.

I do not wish to lay any stress on the antithesis 'ter...non semel' (the Greek πολλάκις τε κοῦχ ἅπαξ) but rather on the 'thrice-repeated cry' io triumphe, with which one may compare the threefold repetitions in the chant of the Arval Brethren, also the thrice-uttered Greek shout of triumph 'τρίγυλλα καλλίνικε'—καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλὸς κεχλαδός, Pindar *Ol.* ix. 2.

H. F. H.

θερίδιον.

In Julian's charming epistle to Evagrius (numbered 46) occurs a word *θερίδιον*, which ought to find a place in the lexicons:—

τοῦτο ἐμοὶ μαιράκιον κομιδῇ νέψ *θερίδιον* ἐδόκει φίλτατον.

θερίδιον is formed from *θερίζω* as *χειμάδιον* from *χειμάζω*.

L. and S. quote Xenophon and Aristotle for *θερίζω* with the meaning of *passing the summer*; but omit the noun. The whole of this letter of Julian shows that he uses it here to indicate a *dwelling for the summer*.

E. J. CHINNOCK.

SUMMERS ON THE ARGONAUTICA.

A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus, by WALTER C. SUMMERS, B.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: G. Bell & Sons.) 2s. 6d.

A WARM welcome must be given to this little book, which forms an excellent introduction to the study of a poet not much read in this country. It is divided into nine sections in which the following subjects are discussed: the name of the author and scope of the poem, similarities of thought and language between Valerius and later writers, the indebtedness of Valerius to his predecessors, especially Apollonius Rhodius and Vergil, the syntax and metre of Valerius, and finally we have some literary and textual criticism. Mr. Summers has treated his subject thoroughly and systematically from his own point of view, but it may perhaps be regretted that he has not made it a more complete 'study' in itself by incorporating the results of the investigations of Schenkl, Thilo and other scholars who are often quoted. As it is, the work of Mr. Summers has to be supplemented by continual reference to their writings, which are more or less difficult of access. Thus the date and life of Valerius are not discussed because 'they have been adequately treated by other writers, especially Thilo.' We should like to see a short statement of Thilo's results. Again, in giving lists of contradictions and lack of connexion in the *Argonautica*, and of imitations from or by other writers, Mr. Summers only makes additions to the lists given by other scholars. I can only say I think it a pity that he has so limited himself.

There is little doubt that the poem, like most other Latin epics, was intended to be in twelve books, and the only question is whether its unfinished state—for we have only about seven and a half books—is due to Valerius himself or to some other cause. The argument of Baehrens to prove that Valerius lived to finish his work amounts to no more than the statement that from a calculation of dates he had time to do so, and that it was customary (?) with the Epic poets of Rome to write and recite a book each year—assuredly a *debile fundamentum* (as Baehrens himself allows) on which to build his conclusion! On the other hand, the absence of reference in Statius to any

incidents on the return voyage of the Argo does not go far to show that Valerius did not finish the poem (the view to which Mr. Summers inclines) when the admitted rarity of reference to these later incidents in other writers is taken into consideration. Schenkl's alleged proof of the original incompleteness of the *Argonautica* from examples of contradictions and want of connexion in the text at various points may be met by the supposition that Valerius, like Vergil, lived to complete his poem but not to revise it, for the examples given by Schenkl and added to by Mr. Summers are not more remarkable than similar examples in the *Aeneid*.

However it be, this point will probably remain a matter of conjecture, as will also the question how far, in his account of the return voyage, Valerius diverged, or intended to diverge, from Apollonius. Certainly the ingenious parallels that are brought forward from the Orphic *Argonautica* tending to show that the author of the latter had Valerius before him—a relationship which Mr. Summers claims, and apparently with good reason, to be the first to have expounded—point to a great divergence from the Greek. This imitation, however, if once admitted, is also evidence *pro tanto* that Valerius did complete his work. Consequently, to save the opposite theory, Mr. Summers has recourse to the highly improbable hypothesis that the account of the return voyage in the Orphic poem 'may be due to some plan of it left behind by Valerius.'

Mr. Summers acutely traces the debts owed by Valerius to his predecessors as regards the subject-matter, but I cannot agree that there is much likelihood of Valerius having had the present Scholia of Apollonius before him, without further evidence that these Scholia were in existence at that time. The three Scholiasts on Apollonius whose names are given are Lucillus of Tarrha, Sophocles, and Theon. Of Sophocles nothing is known, of Lucillus hardly anything, and if Theon, as is thought likely, was the well-known grammarian of that name and father of Hypatia, his date is of course much later than Valerius. No doubt an unmistakable reference of Valerius to these Scholia would be a different matter, and would in its turn help to date them for us, but the two references given are merely conjectural. Far the most important pre-

decessors of Valerius are Apollonius and Vergil, and to them naturally most space is devoted. The influence of Apollonius is both direct and indirect. The direct influence appears under three aspects: (1) more or less literal renderings of the Greek, (2) similes, (3) various episodes. Of the episodes it is said that Valerius 'likes to treat with comparative brevity points which had already been dwelt upon in detail, and conversely.' From this I see no reason to dissent, but when it is added as an example 'that the gathering of the heroes which takes up only a score or so of lines in Greek, occupies here [in Valerius] a couple of hundred,' I am not sure that I understand what is meant. In Apollonius the gathering of the heroes, which I should take to mean the catalogue of the Argonauts, occupies 211 lines, not merely a score or so. The indirect influence of Apollonius is found all through the poem. Most readers will agree with Mr. Summers that Valerius is superior in artistic arrangement and probability. Two pages are devoted to a comparison between Apollonius and Valerius in their treatment of love. On this well-worn theme I do not desire to say much, because after all is said each reader will probably retain his own view. I do not however consider that Prof. Ellis in his review of the present work in the *Academy* some time ago has quite done justice to Mr. Summers on this point. He writes: 'I cannot agree with Mr. Summers in his apparent preference for Valerius in his treatment of love: he finds this superiority in the gradual and artistic development of Medea's passion. But the natural frigidity (which he admits) of the Roman always makes itself felt, nor can it be said that his genius led him instinctively to the exhibition of female passion. Whereas from the moment when Apollonius' Medea appears upon the scene, it is perceptible that the poet has reached the point of real interest, the vital centre of his art. Till then he is the mere narrator; thenceforward he is identified with his heroine, and steps, so to speak, on the stage in his own person.' With the excellent judgment herein contained I agree emphatically: at the same time Mr. Summers hardly goes so far as to pronounce in favour of Valerius in his description of love on the whole. What he says is, 'The strong point in the description of Valerius is that he has depicted the gradual growth of love better than either of his predecessors.' Upon this however I should at once join issue. Vergil's Dido I put aside, as a delineation incomparably

superior to anything in Apollonius, much more in Valerius; but, after all, is there such a thing in ancient classical literature as the gradual growth of love? I fail to see it either in Euripides, Apollonius, Vergil, Ovid, or Valerius. Love is represented as something introduced into the human soul from outside and is entirely beyond the control of the subject of the passion. It is a fate, a disease, a heaven-sent plague. Hence the mechanical contrivances for its production which are so tasteless to us, such as the arrows of Eros &c. In Apollonius Eros shoots an arrow at Medea. It takes effect and inflames her with the love for Jason required for the purposes of Hera. Cupid takes the form of Iulus *noctem non amplius unam* and inspires Dido with love for Aeneas. Ovid's heroines are victims to fate, Phaedra, Ariadne, Hypsipyle. Medea says of her love for Jason *et me mea fata trahebant*. Is it different with Valerius? We read that Juno borrows the cestus of Venus and repairs to Medea in the guise of her sister Chalciope. Mr. Summers says 'the use of the cestus is not at all clear.' But surely it is very clear, its use is the same as in the 14th book of the *Iliad*, viz. to give the wearer the power of inspiring love whether it be for herself, as in Homer, or for some one else, as in Valerius. It is true that Medea had had a previous chance meeting with Jason, but that was not enough. It was necessary that she should have an all-absorbing passion for him and this had to be brought about by the application of some external force. What appears to be the gradual growth of love is, I venture to think, rather the various manifestations of the passion which, subsisting there all the time, a full-blown rose from the first, is ready to be called into action at the 'psychological moment.' If these remarks are just, and they enunciate the same view as that taken by Sainte-Beuve in his well-known article on the Medea of Apollonius, then the alleged superiority of the Roman poet falls to the ground.

The sections on the imitations from previous Latin writers (in which Mr. Summers refutes Baehrens, who denies any imitation from Ovid and allows very few from Lucan), on the syntax and the prosody of Valerius are very well done. I cannot help thinking that in one point, where it is said that of the genuine trochaic caesura we have four or five examples while Mueller admits only one, Mr. Summers has misunderstood Mueller, who seems to have meant only

one case of a trochaic caesura without a hephthemimeral caesura too. Mueller's example is iii. 191

frater Hagen Thapsumque securigerumque
Nealcen.

In all the other cases cited by Mr. Summers there is a hephthemimeral caesura as well. It is clear that *egō* in viii. 158 cannot stand and we must adopt Mueller's *ego o* or make some greater change. Speaking of Valerius' style, Mr. Summers finds, peculiar to Valerius, 'a fulness and copiousness of expression which adds little to the meaning.' But surely this repetition of the thought is a marked feature of Vergil's style too, to which Henry in his voluminous and amusing commentary constantly calls attention, speaking of it as *theme* and *variation*.

The last section deals with the text in a judicious and conservative manner. ii. 641

cannot, I believe, be satisfactorily translated as it stands, nor does Mr. Summers make much of it. In vii. 156 we should surely read *pudore* with Baehrens (after Voss) for *pudori*, and thus at once restore sense and grammar. I have noticed a few examples of slight errors or misprints. At the bottom of p. 49 two more commas are needed to make the sense obvious. Twice the late Prof. Sellar has his name spelt Sellars, in the note on p. 21 *Mên* should be *Mene* or *Mênê*, and on p. 71 *uestu* is a misprint for *ueste*. It has naturally occurred to me to attempt to point out what I consider to be defects rather than to take up room with commendation, the former being a more useful if less gracious task, but I cannot conclude without expressing once more my sense of the great merit of Mr. Summers' work.

R. C. SEATON.

THE NEW EDITION OF PAULY'S ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung, herausgegeben von G. Wissowa, (Metzler) Stuttgart. 1893—4. Vol. I 2902 columns (*Aal* to *Apollokrates*). 30 Mk.

PAULY'S *Real-Encyclopädie*, originally published in six volumes (1839—52), takes its title from its first editor, AUGUST PAULY (1796—1845), who was one of the staff of teachers at the Gymnasium at Stuttgart. The first volume of the original work appeared in 1839, and, after the death of Pauly, the last three volumes were edited by Teuffel (1820—78) and Walz (1802—1857), the former of whom completely recast the first volume for its second issue in 1864—6. A new edition of the whole work is now in preparation under the general editorship of Dr. Georg Wissowa, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Marburg, who is already known as the editor of the second edition of Mommsen's *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*. He has secured the co-operation of nearly 120 experts in different departments of Classical learning; the work will be comprised in ten large volumes of about 1450 pages each, and will be completed in ten years.

The first volume, which has been published
NO. LXXVI. VOL. IX.

in two parts, now lies before us. It is practically an entirely new work, and, owing to its thoroughness and completeness, deserves the warmest welcome from all who know the value of a comprehensive and absolutely trustworthy book of reference in the departments of Classical Mythology, Geography, Biography, History, Literature, Archaeology, Art and Antiquities. One of the many advantages of the new edition is that it includes all the names of persons of any historical importance whatsoever. Thus, under the heading of *Alexandros* we have no less than 107 persons of that name; under that of *Annius*, as many as 127 members of the *gens Annia*, including Milo and Marcus Aurelius. It does not profess to compete with what has been justly described by Mr. Tozer as 'that model of compendious learning,' Pape-Benseler's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, which necessarily includes many names entirely unknown to fame. Thus Agamestor son of Laius (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 852), Agasicles of Sicyon (Pausan. 2, 10, 3), and Agathophanes of Cythnos (known by an inscription alone) are to be found in Pape-Benseler, but not in the new Pauly. Similarly, the Amaryllis of Theocritus, who lives in the *Pastoralia* of Longus, and is immortalized by Virgil and Milton, has apparently too shadowy an existence to find

a place in a *Real-Encyclopädie*. On the other hand, while only six of the name of Agatharchus are recorded in Pape-Benseler, as many as fifteen are distinguished in Pauly.

Among the most important articles in the present volume are *Achaia* (by Toepffer) with the most comprehensive account which has yet appeared of the constitution of the Achaean League; *Aetolia* (Wilcken), *Aegina* (Hirschfeld), *Amphictyonia* (Cauer); *Aeschines*, *Andocides* and *Antiphon* (Thalheim); *Alcibiades* (Toepffer), *Antiochus* (Wilcken and others); *Aeschylus* and *Alcaeus* (Dieterich), *Anthologia* (L. Schmidt), *Apollodorus*, the Greek 'grammarians' (thirty-one columns, by Schwartz); *Annaeus*, including Lucan and the Senecas (by several writers); *Alphabet* (Szanto and Joh. Schmidt); *Amazons* (Graef), *Altar* (fifty columns, by Reisch) and *Aphrodite* (fifty-eight, by Dümmler). Agriculture and Botany are well represented by an important article on *Ackerbau*, and by shorter notices of *Apfel* and *Anemone* (by Olck); Superstition, folk-lore &c. by *Aberglaube* (sixty-four columns, by Riess); and Greek Constitutional and legal antiquities are dealt with in numerous short articles (by Szanto and Thalheim). As an indication of the completeness of the work it may be noticed that the recondite question of the ἀμυγῆς βίβλοι in the Alexandrian Library, though mentioned by Tzetzes alone, is discussed in a column and a half, while even the *Anonymi* have eleven columns assigned to them. The articles in general, so far as I have consulted them, are written in a terse and clear, perhaps rather dry and decidedly 'objective' style, and are equipped with an abundance of references to ancient and modern authorities.

It is easy to find omissions in so large a range of references. Thus, in the articles on *Antiphon* and *Andocides*, one might have looked for some mention of M. Georges Perrot's *l'Éloquence Politique et Judiciaire à Athènes (les Précurseurs de Démosthène)*, and also of Professor Jebb's *Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus*. In the article on *Alkidamas*, a reference might have been added to Mr. Cope's notice of that rhetorician in his articles on the 'Sophistical Rhetoric' (*Journal of Cl. and Sacred Philo-*

logy, iii 263—8). In the article on ἀνάκειον the statement that, in Aristotle's 'Aθ. πολ. 15 § 4, the reading is 'really' ἐν τῷ 'Ανακείῳ is inconsistent with the fact that Mr. Kenyon has since withdrawn that reading in favour of ἐν τῷ Θηρείῳ, and has been followed in this by all subsequent editors, even Wilamowitz, who was once most eager for retaining 'Ανακείῳ, having now acquiesced in Θηρείῳ (*Aristot. u. Athen*, i 266, note 17). Under *Anacreon*, [Plato's] *Hipparchus*, which is quoted as an authority for the poet's call to the court of the Peisistratidae, should now be supplemented by a reference to 'Aθ. πολ. 18 § 1. Lastly, under δδύκιον we should expect some notice of Hyperides, in *Demosthenes*, col. 24, 15.

The work is very sparingly illustrated. The only cuts in this volume are a diagram explaining the use of the *abacus*, a map of the neighbourhood of *Amphipolis*, a small plan of *Akragas* which, though good for its size, is inferior to those published in Schubring's monograph and in Freeman's *Sicily*, a fairly large map of Alexandria, and lastly an excellent plan of the temple and precinct of *Amphiarrus* at *Oropos*. It is a matter of some regret that the cuts are so few; *amphora* and *altar* are completely unillustrated; and we fear that when, in the fulness of time, we reach the subject of *Vases*, we shall have to rely on other works of reference if we are to retain a vivid apprehension of all the variety of type that is characteristic of these interesting relics of antiquity. Let us hope that the publisher may repent, and that, some ten years hence, the success of the present work will have proved to be so great as to prompt him to produce, as a thank-offering at its close, a handsome supplementary volume of illustrations only, executed in the excellent style that is not unknown at Stuttgart.

Meanwhile, the work which has made so good a beginning fully deserves to find a place in the Library of every College in England and the United States, and also on the shelves of every scholar who desires to keep abreast with the latest results of modern research.

J. E. SANDYS.

A NEW THEORY OF WORD-FORMS.

Die Entstehung der Dehnstufe. Von WILHELM STREITBERG. Strassburg: Trübner. 1895.

In the armoury of philologists for the last twenty years accent has been the most important weapon. A theory of accent produced Brugmann's doctrine of sonant nasals and liquids, another theory of accent produced Fick's explanation of the interchange of *e* and *o* vowels in the same root. The new theory with which this paper deals is also founded upon accent, although it rises in the end to a suggestion that the physical theory of the Conservation of Energy extends to language. The theory deals with processes which took place in the original Indo-germanic language, but which have parallels in its modern descendants. Moreover it deals with words in their finished and complete form. As the author says with justice, the theory is not exposed to the objections which attach to all schemes of root-expansion and the like—theories which he obviously regards, as do others, with considerable suspicion.

Ever since modern theories of sound-change began, the question has repeatedly been raised: Why, for example in Greek, should we have such forms as *πατήρ* with a long vowel while all other cases from the same stem *πατέρα*, *πατράσι*, *πατρός* have either a short stem-vowel or no vowel at all? Why in Latin *pēs* but *pēdem*, *pēdis*? Again, why *Zeús* with an acute accent, *vaús* with a circumflex? To all of these questions various answers have been given at different times. But like the priest of Nemi each answer obtained sway by the slaughter of its predecessor and held its power only till a better came. And change followed change with wonderful rapidity. The present theory, if not armed against all conclusions, seems at least less easy of overthrow than its predecessors.

The theory which Professor Streitberg sets forth in this treatise—a reprint from vol. iii. of the *Indogermanische Forschungen*—is not in all respects new. Several scholars, Johansson, Bechtel, Michels, have contributed among them great part of the materials. All that Professor Streitberg modestly claims to have done is to co-ordinate the results of the scholars mentioned, and to have corrected them where correction was necessary. In fact, out of scattered hints unsupported or but scantily supported on the part of

their authors by evidence, he has built up the structure of a complete theory. Curiously enough he seems not to know of a scholar who had promulgated an attempted scheme earlier than any of the three scholars to whom he refers. In the introduction to *Den graeske Nominal-flexion* published by Dr. Torp at Christiania in 1890 a cruder and less complete scheme than Dr. Streitberg's is to be found. Whether, however, it is Dr. Torp's own, or borrowed, there is, if I mistake not, nothing in the little book to show.

The question to be answered is: What are the causes why original short vowels should be found lengthened in certain definite groups of instances? Dr. Streitberg's reply is: 'If a mora has been lost in a word, an accented short syllable immediately preceding the lost mora is lengthened, while a long syllable immediately preceding, if it has the acute accent, changes it to the circumflex.'

The loss of a mora may take place in one or other of three ways: (1) a whole syllable may be lost, (2) a long syllable succeeding the accented syllable may be shortened, (3) a long diphthong like *āu*, *ōu*, *ān*, *ōn* (for *u* and *n* discharge in such combinations precisely similar functions) may lose its second component. Dr. Streitberg brings analogies from many modern languages to show that a similar rule prevails there also. An illustration from English, which he does not mention, will elucidate the rule as well as another. If the rule propounded above were to hold true in modern English, a disyllable like *cannot* (pronounced *cánot*) should be represented when reduced to a monosyllable by a syllable containing a long vowel *cānt*, the two morae represented by the two short vowels being now represented by one long vowel (=two morae). This is really what happens, for the result of repeated experiment is to show that *can't* takes precisely the same time to pronounce in ordinary conversation as *cannot*.

The so-called monosyllabic root-words are therefore a development out of disyllabic words; the Doric *πός* (the vocalism of the Attic *ποός* is still unexplained), the Latin *pēs* represent therefore a more original **pōdos* or **pēdos*. The Latin *vōx* must be carried back to a form **uogōs* parallel to the Homeric accusative (*F*) *όπα*, parallel also to the neuter word *féros*. Disyllabic and

monosyllabic forms from the same root often stand side by side, naturally often with a difference of meaning: *φóρος*, *φώρ*; *κλoσός*, *κλώψ*. The Greek *δῶ* in *χαλκοβατῆς δῶ* and the like represents an older **dōm* parallel to *δóμος* and Lat. *domus*. It is impossible here to go into further detail on such stems. A word, however, on two of special interest: *Zeús*, Sanskrit *dyāus*; *βοῦς*, Skt. *gāus*. These stems are distinguished, according to Streitberg, from those which have an original long vowel by this point, amongst others, that in the latter class the long vowel is carried throughout the paradigm; *vāes*, *vḥes* but *boés*, Lat. *nāvēs* but *lōvēs*. The original forms, therefore, corresponding to *Zeús* and *βοῦς* were **diēuos* and **gōuos*, from which came according to this law **diēus*, **gōus*; the original form for *vāes* was **nāuos*. We now see that the substantive *γλαῦξ* may owe its circumflex by the side of its adjective *γλαυκός* to the loss of a mora in an original form **glāukos*. The diphthong with acute accent represents two morae, the diphthong with the circumflex three.

Another interesting series are the root-stems in composition. Streitberg shows that root-stems are commoner in composition than as separate words and that an *-o*-stem as a separate word often has a root-stem parallel to it in compounds; cp. *ζυγόν* with *νεόζυξ*, Lat. *semi-fer* with *ferus*. Where the accent passes forward to the first element, there a so-called root-stem has arisen in the second element by the loss of final *-os*, and root-words like *πτύξ* arise by resolution of compounds into their component parts, the separate word being properly of the type **πτύχος*. The numerous Sanskrit root-stems in composition followed by *-t* (*gō-jī-t* 'cattle-winning,' *dharma-dhī-t* 'law-observing' &c.) are successfully explained by Streitberg as reduced forms of *-to*-stems, stems which were not originally and never are exclusively passive.

It is now clear how the question as to the origin of *πατήρ* can be answered. It represents an earlier **patēros*. The suffixes *-μῆν* (*ποιμῆν*), *-μῶν* (*ἡγεμῶν*), *-ής* (*εὐγενής*), *-ως* (*ἡώς*) stand side by side with suffixes having a short stem vowel followed by *-o*, as in the participial *-μενος* &c. The *-s*-stems had no doubt at one time more parallels with a vowel suffix than Streitberg allows. The Homeric *γενεή* must represent **γενεσῆ* by the side of *γένος*. These stems with a vowel suffix must surely have existed to a large extent in early Latin; otherwise it is hard to see why from consonant stems we should have verbs of the type *gener-ā-re*,

moder-ā-re &c. With regard to forms of the type of *ἱππεύς* also it is difficult to feel that Streitberg has reached a satisfactory conclusion. He would make them arise by contamination between the type represented by the Zend *bāzāuš* (=original *-ōuo-*) and the type represented by the Sanskrit *aravāṇs*. But if **diēuos* becomes *Zeús* why may not **ekēuos* become *ἱππεύς*?

Professor Streitberg follows his theory through the other cases—locative, vocative, accusative—with great success. The short form of the suffix in the vocative arises by its throwing forward the accent: *πατήρ* but *πάτερ*. But whether this change of accent position is due to enclisis of the vocative in principal sentences, as Streitberg following Hirt is inclined to believe, is another story. One most ingenious point is made in the treatment of the accusative. The question is raised: why *βῶν*=Skt. *gām*, *Ζῆν*=Skt. *dyāñ* with circumflex? The answer is: From an original **gōuom*, **diēuom* would come **gōum*, **diēum* as monosyllables; the mora represented by *-u-* is lost, and according to the second part of the rule the circumflex appears instead of the acute accent. On the other hand there is no lengthening in accusatives like *πόδα*, *ποιμένα* or *ἡγεμόνα*, for in these no mora is lost; the final syllable is still represented by *-a*. A long form of the accusative is found only in such stems as carry a long vowel throughout the whole paradigm; *αἶθωα*, genitive *αἶθωος*, &c.

One curious result may be mentioned in passing. Streitberg declares himself a convert to the theory, to which Brugmann has clung throughout amid almost universal opposition, that original *ō* in an open syllable is represented in Skt. by *ā*.

The treatment of the genitive is interesting. It has often been held on the ground of the requirements of the Teutonic and Slavonic languages that there must have been a genitive suffix in *-so*. The present theory requires that the *-so*-suffix should be original. The treatment however of the genitive **podo-so* seems to me inconclusive. Streitberg contends that this form had the principal accent on the first syllable, the last syllable disappeared having no accent, while the middle syllable having some amount of accent survived; hence **podos* out of **pōdōso*. This contention seems at variance with the rest of the theory; at any rate it requires, in order to be convincing, a fuller treatment than it receives.

The verb is a less fertile field than the noun, but here too the theory obtains some

interesting results. The 3rd person of the perfect γέγρε is the same as the Skt. *jajāna*; the Skt. 1st person *jajāna* should be represented in Greek by *γέγενα. The Skt. causative *bhūrayati* represents by its *ā* the same original sound as in φερ- of φερέω; the Aryan passive aorist which appears only in the 3rd person singular (Skt. *avāci*, Zend *avāci* &c.) is explained, after Osthoff, as a substantive form of the same type as στρόφι-, τρόχι- in Greek, which, like other noun forms, has engrafted itself upon the verb. The only part of the verb where the working of the theory is certainly manifested is in the -s aorists. The suffix is shown to occur in three forms: -es- -es- and -s-; but

the vowel is recognized as in reality part of the root; Skt. *a-nāisam* is therefore developed from **a-nayi-sam*. Other points regarding the verb cannot be illustrated from the classical languages and may be left to the reader to find for himself.

In conclusion it may be said that Professor Streitberg's style is a model of lucidity, that the paper contains many points which have not been mentioned here, and that the conclusions, if they can on the whole be held to be established, as I think they can, make it the most important article that has appeared on such subjects for a considerable time.

P. GILES.

MERRY'S EDITION OF THE WASPS.

THE latest instalment of Dr. Merry's edition of Aristophanes maintains the high level of its predecessors. It displays the same literary skill in translation, the same refined scholarship, and the same delicate appreciation of wit and humour.

To the man of the world, who wishes to renew his acquaintance with the greatest works of Aristophanes, no edition can be more highly recommended. As school-books, Dr. Merry's volumes have the merit, which is rarely met with in present-day text-books, of not superseding the use of grammar or dictionary. They are suggestive without being exhaustive.

The *Vespæ* has of late attracted much attention from scholars. The edition of Mr. B. B. Rogers is familiar to all lovers of literature. During the last few years have appeared the commentaries of Dr. Blaydes and Prof. Van Leeuwen, and recently the school-editions of Dr. Merry and Mr. Graves. After the exhaustive work of Dr. Blaydes, editions for some years to come will be but *τεμάχῃ* from his δειπνα. Nothing is left to commentators but the labour of judicious selection. His edition is a mine of learning. To one who wishes to tread with a firm foot the mazes of Attic diction, his work is indispensable, although the redundancy of expression and the extraordinary haste with which he has thrown his materials together sometimes so exasperate the reader that he is tempted to cry out (with a slight variation of Socrates' words) ἄλλως με προδίδασκε ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποφου-

τήσω. Indeed, in the absence of an index, his commentary is:—

Monstrum horrendum informe ingens cui
lumen ademptum.

Still, although one of the extremities of this monster may be βολίτινον, assuredly the other is not of brass, but of gold.

The edition of Mr. Graves can be compared more fairly with Dr. Merry's. It is equally scholarly, though perhaps it falls below the other in literary taste and originality. However it possesses the merit of giving the chief MSS. variants at the foot of the page, and of marking the *Strophes* and *Antistrophes* in the choral odes, and the divisions of the Parabasis. The omission of all such marks is the great defect of Dr. Merry's edition. It is a work of some difficulty to discover where the *Strophes* end and the *Antistrophes* begin.

To the schoolboy no doubt, for whom this edition is primarily intended, the metrical character of a choral ode is one of the mysteries of Faith. *Credunt quia non intellegunt*. In Dr. Merry's edition the lines are cut into apparently equal lengths, but, on a closer examination, this superficial correspondence is found, in many cases, to fall to the ground. A few instances will prove my point.

Vesp. 296—

Ἄ| στραγάλους δῆπουθεν, ὦ παῖ.

in the *Strophe* is supposed to correspond with line 308—

πόρον Ἑλλας ἱερόν.

Quite apart from the question of metre, Hermann's *εὐρεῖν* improves the sense. No doubt, this is an instance of the error called *haplography*.

Vesp. 407 foll.—

νῦν ἐκείνο νῦν ἐκείνο
τοῦξέθυμον, ᾧ κολαζό-
μιστα, κέντρον ἐντέτατ' ὀξέ.

The last line must correspond with line 465—

ὥς λάθρα γ' ἐλάμβαν' ὑπιοῦσά με.

This passage requires very careful treatment. As the other lines, in this part of the chorus, are trochaic, there must be something wrong with both 409 and 465.

I believe that Blaydes is right in rejecting ὀξέ, which is obviously due to ὀξέθυμον, and in reading *ἐκτετάσθω*.

With regard to line 465, which is much too long and redundant in expression, I believe that λάθρα is a gloss on ὑπό in ὑπιοῦσα, and that ἐλάνθανεν of BCSV is right. So I suggest :—

ὥς ἐλάνθανεν ὑπιοῦσά μ' :

or, if we keep ὀξέ, ὥς ἐλάνθανέν γ' κ.τ.λ.
Vesp. 410—

καὶ κελεύετ' αὐτὸν ἦκειν
ὥς ἐπ' ἄνδρα μισόπολιν
ὄντα κάπολούμενον, ὅτι
τόνδε λόγον εἰσφέρει,
ὥς χρὴ μὴ δικάζειν δίκας.

must correspond with *Vesp.* 468—

οὔτε τιν' ἔχων πρόφασιν
οὔτε λόγον εὐτράπελον
αὐτὸς ἀρχων μόνος.

The first thing to be said with regard to these passages is that the last three lines of the *Antistrophe* are excellent *Cretics*, and that the last three lines of the *Strophe* must be made to correspond. This can be done without much difficulty. ὥς χρὴ must be rejected, with many editors, as a gloss. In line 412, I suggest κάπολούμενον ὅτι—*ὄντα* is not required. For the short syllable at the end of a *Cretic*, compare

Ach. 301 κατατεμῶ τοῖσιν ἱππεῦσι καττύματα.

Two lines must have been lost in the *Antistrophe* corresponding with 410—11.

In line 411, I read μισόδημον with Herm. to make the verse trochaic.

Vesp. 418—

ὦ πόλι καὶ Θεώρου θεοισεχθρία.

This is a very strange *Cretic*. Read πόλις.

Vesp. 474—

σοὶ λόγους, ᾧ μισόδημ καὶ μοναρχίας ἐραστά.

This is supposed to correspond with line 417 :—

ταῦτα δὴτ' οὐ δεινὰ καὶ τυραννίς ἐστιν ἐμφανής ;

Dindorf's ἔρων is a very easy correction.

Vesp. 335—

λέξ | ον' πρὸς εἵνους γὰρ φράσεις.

must correspond with line 343 :—

ὅτι λέγεις τι περὶ τῶν νε | ὦν.

Σύ, or a similar word, must be inserted after λέγεις.

It is very difficult to understand what Dr. Merry's views are with regard to *Strophic* correspondence. In these days of metrical heresies, one could sympathize with an editor who gave up the whole question in despair. But Dr. Merry is more sanguine. On line 339 he says 'There must be something wrong in καὶ τίνα πρόφασιν ἔχων as the line does not correspond metrically with ἄλλ' ἔπαγε τὴν γνάθον' (370). The correspondence seems to me perfect. In his text he prints the line without καὶ, thus destroying the correspondence. Again, on line 526, νῦν δὴ τὸν ἐκ θήμετρον, he says 'νῦν δὴ is introduced for metrical reasons, νῦν δέ R. and V.' Verily, this is straining at a gnat. In the very next line he prints without remark the unmetrical γυμνασίον λέγειν τι δέ to correspond with 632 οὐδενὸς ἠκούσαμεν οὐ | δέ. Obviously we must read γυμνασίον δέ τι λέγειν.

Again, 638 κοῦδεν παρήλθει, ὥστ' ἔγωγ' must correspond with τόνδε λέγειν ὄρας γὰρ ὥς (532). Read κοῦτι. Again, 749 πιθόμενός τέ σοι is supposed to correspond with 736 σὺ δέ παρὼν δέχου. The emendation is obvious, viz. πιθόμενος. Indeed, apart from metrical reasons, this is the more

common form in Aristophanes. 886 must be read as an Iambic line (with Porson), εἵνεκα being corrected to ἔνεκα. The same inconsistency is to be observed throughout. At times, Dr. Merry's chivalrous trust in the impeccability of the copyists is pathetic, though misplaced. He seems to think with Vivien 'Unfaith in aught is want of faith in all.' In this spirit, he prints ἡκηκύνειν and ἦν (although R. gives ἦ, *Vesp.* 1091) as 1st persons singular. Has the teaching of Cobet and Rutherford been writ in water? In *Aves* 511 τοῦτ' οὐκ ἦδεν 'γὼ is the reading of most MSS.

27 δεινὸν γέ που 'στ' κ.τ.λ. Surely τοῦστ' is right. As we were taught at school, γέ τοι assents with a limitation, and may be translated 'at any rate.' The stock quotation used to be *Vesp.* 934 ἐπιμαίει γέ τοι. In many places Dr. Merry maltreats these particles, e.g. 912 read ἐμοί γέ τοι (not ἐμοι γέ τοι). In lines 25 and 155, he gives the unmetrical ἰδόντι τοιοῦτον ἐνύπνιον and φύλαττέ' ὅ' ὅπως, without comment. I have no doubt that A. Palmer's τοῦτο τοῖνύπνιον is right in the former passage, and that, in the latter, we should read (with Elmsley) μοχλοῦ | φύλατθ'.

Vesp. 471, he reads:—

ἔσθ' ὅπως ἄν εἰν μάχης καὶ τῆς κατοξείας βοῆς
ἐς λόγους ἔλθοιμεν ἀλλήλοισι καὶ διαλλαγῇ;

In his notes he says ὅπως is not a final conjunction, but equivalent to *qua ratione*, and for the opt. he refers to the well-known passages *A. Agam.* 620, and *E. Alc.* 52. Now, it must be noted that this construction only occurs in tragedy, and, with the single exception of *Alc.* 52, in negative sentences. If ever there was a certain emendation, it is Hermann's ἀν ἐκ μάχης. Its truth is shown by line 866 ὅτι γενναίως ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου | καὶ τοῦ νείκουσιν ξυνέβητον.

Vesp. 602—

σκέψαι δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν οἷων ἀποκλείεις καὶ
κατερύκεις.

This is Dr. Merry's text, which is very hard to translate. Bergk's emendation σκέψαι δέ μ' ὅσων ἄ. οἷων τ' κ.τ.λ.—so far, at least, as ὅσων is concerned,—seems to me certain.

Vesp. 709, he refuses to accept δύο μυριάδ' ἀν τῶν δημοτικῶν ζῶν ἐν πᾶσι λαγώφαι—the easy correction of Dobree—on the ground that ἀν is not necessary in the apodosis of a non-fulfilled condition. He appeals to one passage in Xenophon to bolster up this

heresy. Cobet has taught scholars how very unsafe a guide Xenophon is in a question of Attic usage. It is, moreover, by no means certain that ἀν has not dropped out after ἡσυχνόμεν in the passage quoted.

Vesp. 694, καθ' ὡς πρίονθ' is more than doubtful, as Aristophanes invariably uses ὥσπερ in a simile. The sole exception quoted is 1490 πτήσσει Φρύνιχος ὡς τις ἀλέκτωρ, which, as Blaydes suggests, may be a quotation from Phrynichus. In his note on 795 Dr. Merry ingeniously defends ἦ δ' ὡς λέγων, quoting ἔφη λέγων from Herodotus. But I know of no instance of λέγων with ἦ δ' ὡς, and, on general grounds, γελῶν makes much better sense. At other times, Dr. Merry is not true to his allegiance. *Vesp.* 121 the *vulgate* ὅτε δὴ δέ (cf. *Ecl.* 195, 315, 827 *et passim*) for ὅτε δῆτα must be recalled: 606 κάπειθ' ἦκονθ' must be restored (from R.) for κατ' εἰσῆκονθ' (a rare word not used in prose).

651. νόσον ἀρχαίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐντετακνίαν.

Dr. Merry accepts Reisk's em. for MSS. ἐντετοκνίαν. The shortening of the α̃ is supported by analogy, but I do not see how the *vulgate* is impossible, if we translate: 'the disease that has littered in the state.'

1157. Dr. Merry accepts ὑπολίον for ἀποδύον, but in 1168 inconsistently keeps ὑποδυσάμενος, although he reads ὑποδίσσασθαι, against the MSS., in 1159.

1309. He rightly reads νεοπλούτῳ Φρυνί for τρυγί. Sometimes Dr. Merry, like the Δίκαιος Λόγος, throwing off his ἱμάτιον, ἐξαντομολεῖ to the opposition. On 1340 he accepts an emendation of that arch radical, Dr. Blaydes, viz.: οὐκ ἄπεισιν ὅστις ἐστίν, (MSS. οὐκ ἄπεισι; ποῦ 'στίν). He would have been wise to have followed that scholar in some other passages. Dr. Blaydes has succeeded by a change of a single letter, or by a slight alteration of the punctuation, in greatly improving the text of many passages. To take the changes of punctuation first. *Vesp.* 385. Read πισυνός καὶ, μανθάνει; ἦν τι πάθω 'γὼ. 448 remove; after θηρίον: otherwise οὐδ' ἀναμνησθείς has no construction. The note of interrogation must be placed after εἶναι in 451. 773. It simplifies the construction to place the μέση στιγμή after καθήμενος. Otherwise the sentence is too loaded (ἐὰν δὲ νίψη... ὄντος). Line 937 the ὑποστιγμή must be removed after παρῆναι, as μάρτυρας is the predicate. Otherwise τοὺς μάρτυρας would be necessary. 957. Read ὃ τι; σοῦ προμάχεται. 1184 the ὑποστιγμή must be removed after κοπρολόγῳ,

and placed after ἔφη. Ἐφη τῷ κοπρολόγῳ is bad Greek. Again, in many cases the change of a single letter improves the text. *Vesp.* 61 ἀνασελγαινόμενος (MSS. ἀνασελγ. cf. ἐμπαρουνεῖν). 110. ἵν' ἔχοι δικάζων (MSS. δικάζων). 125. ἐξαφρίεμεν (Nauck for MSS. ἐξαφρίομεν). 128. ἐπεβύσαμεν (MSS. ἐνεβύσαμεν). 201. τὴν δοκὸν (MSS. τῇ δοκῷ). 319. ὅπ' ἀκούων or ἐπακούων (MSS. ὑπακούων, which is unmeaning here). 353. ὅπια (MSS. ὅπιν). 422. καὶ σέ γ' αὐτοῖς ἐξολοῦμεν (MSS. αὐτῖς, which is not a Comic form). 452. ἀλλ' ἀφές με καὶ σὺ καὶ σύ (MSS. ἄνες). 544. θαλλοφόροι καλούμεθα (MSS. καλοῖμεθα). 676. ὕρχας οἶνον (so the line is cited by Pollux; MSS. ὕρχας. οἶνον). 790. κάπειτ' ἐνέθηκε (MSS. ἐπέθηκε—cf. ἐνθεσις 'a mouthful'). 978. αἰτείσθε (MSS. αἰτέιτε, which cannot mean 'supplicate'). 1032. οὐ δεινότεραι μὲν ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν Κύννης ἀκτίνες θαμπόν. *A brachylogy of comparison* (MSS. δεινότεραι). 1107. ὥσπερ ἐς τάνθηρην—(MSS. ὥσπερεῖ. Ἀνθρήνιον is the nest not the hornet). 1116. πόνον κατεσθίουσιν (MSS. γόνον). 1418. μὴ μὴ καλέσῃ (MSS. καλέσῃς. προσκαλοῦμαι occurs in the preceding line). 1436. οὗτος (MSS. αὐτός). 1118. τεθεώρηκα οὐδαμοῖ (MSS. οὐδαμοῦ).

With reference to Dr. Blaydes' emendation of *Vesp.* 21 προβαλεῖ τις τοῖσι συμπότησι λέγων—(MSS. προσερεῖ) I feel inclined to say, as Bentley said of one of his own emendations, *aut ita scripsit Aristophanes aut deliravit*. Blaydes' note shows that προβάλλειν is the word invariably used of propounding a γρίφος. If it is right, how can we explain the blunder in the MSS.? Dr. Merry's προσερεῖ will not do, especially with λέγων at the end of the line. Προαγορεῖν means 'to proclaim.' I had thought of προφέρειν, which sometimes means to propose, as the future does not seem to be necessary since Aristophanes is quoting a riddle which was commonly proposed at dinner-parties. But προβαλεῖ is much better. So much for the text.

I have noticed very few errors or omissions in the notes.

Vesp. 3. The imperfect of προσφείλω should be προῦφειλες, not προῦφειλες. I do not see what there is to object to in the present προῦφειλες. It is not every ἄρα that is followed by an imperfect. 10. πτόμενον, not πτάμενον, is the Comic form. 12. νυστακτής is an imitation of a Persian proper name. I have heard it translated 'from the land of Nod.' 40. βόειος also = stupid (so Schol.). 58. There is no note on the *Schema Pindaricum*. 92. ἐκεῖ could not mean 'during his nap'—Rogers is right. 151. There is

no note on Κάπνιον. As the poet does not seem παρατραγωδεῖν, I suggest τοῦ Καπνίου. 201. προσκυλίσον is an impossible accentuation. 221. ἦδη ποτέ with the future is very strange. It ought to mean *jam dudum*. We may compare Lucan 2, 524 *jam dudum moriture*. 242. It ought to be noted that this is the only passage (*Fr.* 48 is doubtful), except in the phrase χθές τε καὶ πρόην, where χθές occurs in Aristophanes in iambics. I believe that Κλέων is a gloss, and that we should read ἐχθές μὲν ὅν ὁ κηδεμών. (I now see that this is Meineke's reading.) 250. The Scholiast recognizes only πρόμνηξον. 243. ποιηράν does not mean 'merciless' but 'not of the best quality,' as ἡμερῶν ὀργὴν τριῶν shows. Aristophanes can never resist a reference to the κρομμυο-εργυμία. 304. The proverb σῶκα αἰτεῖν is not explained—σῶκα φαγεῖν = τρυφᾶν (so Schol.). 334. ταῦτα εἰργόν could not mean 'bar from this,' but 'in this way.' 357. ἰσχυον αὐτὸς ἐμαντοῦ, as the parallel passages show, does not mean 'was master of my own actions,' but 'was in the plenitude of my powers.' 460. ἄρ' ἐμέλλομέν ποτ' ὑμᾶς ἀποσοβήσιν; Dr. Merry propounds the strange heresy that ἄρα is not an interrogative, and compares *Ach.* ἐμελλον ἄρα. The position makes all the difference. 661. It should be noted that καταθές always means 'to pay money' not 'to set down' and that ἐμαντοῦ has the article, which is indispensable, in all MSS. I believe that Blaydes' emendation, which occurred to me independently, is right—ἀπὸ τούτου νῦν τοῖσι δικάσαις θές μισθὸν τοῦ γ' ἐμαντοῦ. κατα may be the remains of -κασαίς. 691. 'δραχμὴν has uniformly ᾗ in Aristophanes.' This sentence must be withdrawn. Blaydes gives some instances: *Pax* 1201; *Plut.* 1019. There is no objection to the lengthening in Anapaestic verse. 771. 'There is no etymological justification for the jingle between ἡλιάσει and ἡλιον.' Dr. Merry forgets that ἡλιάζεσθαι also means *apricari*. 917. No notice is taken of the Scholiast's explanation of κοινός = κοινωνός. Cf. *Oed. R.* 240. 955. οἷός τε πολλοῖς προβατίοις ἐφιστάται. Dr. Merry has a strange note 'usually some part of the verb εἰμί is introduced to complete this phrase, but not always.' In that case there would be no connecting particle. The line means 'and qualified to' etc.

Vesp. 1208—9—

ΒΔΕ. παῦ' ἀλλὰ δευρὶ κατακλινεῖς προμάνθανε
ἐμπροστικὸς εἶναι καὶ ξυνουσιαστικός.

It has not been remarked by any commentator, so far as I know, that Bdelycleon is here affecting the style and language of the Athenian *jeunesse dorée*, which Aristoph. *Knights* satirizes, 1378 foll. :—

ΔΗ. συνερκτικός γάρ ἐστι καὶ περαντικός
καὶ γνωμοτυπικός καὶ σαφὴς καὶ
κρουστικός
καταληπτικός τ' ἄριστα τοῦ θορυβη-
τικού.

ΑΓΟΡ. οὐκ οὖν καταδακτυλικὸς σὺ τοῦ λαλη-
τικού.

1397. There is no note on the very extraordinary form *θυγατέρος*. If it is right, we must hold that the *ἀρτόπωλις* speaks, in

Epic phrase, like the daughter of a queen. 1434. 'Well you must bear in mind the answer he gave.' ἀλλ' οὖν means 'at any rate.' As αὐτὸς cannot mean 'he,' we must accept Blaydes' οὗτος. 1454. It must be noticed that all MSS. have ἦ. Dr. Merry's account of the readings of the MSS. is not quite correct. 1455. For ἔχοι cf. Soph. ἀφ' ὧν ἔχοι τε καὶ δύναιτο. It is generally used in maxims. 1483. 'The mischief is indeed spreading': καὶ δὴ means 'already.'

Sed haec quidem hactenus. Dr. Merry's notes are so admirable in style and matter that it is very difficult even for the most captious critic to find anything that provokes comment.

W. J. M. STARRIE.

GRAVES' EDITION OF THE WASPS.

The Wasps of Aristophanes, edited by C. E. GRAVES, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.

WITH this addition to previously published literature on the subject, English students may consider themselves exceptionally well off in aids for studying this amusing and instructive play. The purpose of the present article is not so much a criticism on a volume which it is doing bare justice to the editor to praise for thoroughness and accuracy, as a discussion of a few places on which it appears to me that light may yet be cast. Any criticism I might offer would be of the nature of a wish that Mr. Graves would have more often the courage of his opinions, and instead of withholding his vote between two rival views (both admirably stated), or merely expressing a doubting preference, would boldly plunge in his ψῆφος on one side or the other κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἀρίστην. The answer, no doubt, may be made that in a book intended for students what is required is that the evidence should be placed before them, and that premature and one-sided views should be discouraged. But experience seems to show that students are too apt to take the view that points about which their teachers tell them that no one knows for certain, are points about which they need not concern themselves. Not only is the definite view more interesting, because it is more definite, but because polemics have an interest of their own. Apart from the exigencies of the student, it seems to me certain that progress in knowledge is best

secured, not by neutrality, but by careful and conscientious advocacy. We get an approach to a solution of a difficulty when we find an increasing preponderance of opinion, independently formed, in favour of one possible reading or explanation over others.

I take as a first illustration v. 36, ἔχουσα φωνὴν ἐμπεπρημένης ὕς, on which Mr. Graves says: 'The meaning [of ἐμπεπρημένης] appears to be "blown out, bloated" (schol. ἐμπεφυσσημένης, παχείας); but it might be "burnt, scalded."' I think the second alternative is made impossible by the tense; for though a pig might make a considerable outcry during the process of singing, it would probably become quieter when the process was accomplished. Buttmann, *Lexilogus* p. 484 (E.T.), quotes a grammarian's note in Hesychius, ὅθεν καὶ ἡμῶς πεπρημένους τοὺς πεφυσσημένους. Perhaps however Meineke is right in keeping the accusative ἐμπεπρημένην with R and V, which with φωνὴν must mean 'at full blast,' with no possible ambiguity.

Take again vv. 1025 sqq.

οὐδ' εἴ τις ἐραστὴς
κωμωδεῖσθαι παιδίχ' ἐαντοῦ μισῶν ἔσπευδε πρὸς
αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.

Does κωμωδεῖσθαι depend on μισῶν or on ἔσπευδε? Mr. Graves says that 'either view can be supported grammatically,' but allows that the latter agrees best with line 1028

ἵνα τὰς Μούσας αἶσιν χρήται μὴ προαγωγὸν ἀποφῆν.

Surely the case can be put more strongly. The question is practically: does the poet claim credit for refusing to insert, or for refusing to suppress, something? He says that if he had either (a) suppressed, or (b) inserted, the matter in question, his Muse might be open to the charge of being *προαγωγός*. It is impossible to me to see how his Muse could in any case become *προαγωγός* by omitting something. Therefore the poet claims credit for refusing to *insert* something. Therefore *κωμωδεῖσθαι* depends on *ἰσπευθε* rather than on *μισῶν*.

In his text Mr. Graves is very conservative; some will perhaps think unduly so. He retains line 135 ἔχων τρόπος φρυγμοσεμνάκους τινάς in its place, notwithstanding the difficulties (which he acknowledges) both as to grammar and sense presented by the line. Whence the line came it is impossible to say; in any case we should, I think, read *φρυγμοσεμνικούς*, the word being an example of the forms in -ικός that were part of the slang of the time (cf. *Eq.* 1378 *sqq.*).

At line 713 Mr. Graves prints the unmetrical οἶμοι τί ποθ' ὥσπερ κ.τ.λ. of the MSS. in spite of strong claims (fortified by Suidas) of the correction οἶμοι τί πέπονθ' ; ὥσπερ κ.τ.λ.

Difficulties in the text reading are always pointed out in the notes, and proposed corrections quoted. One or two readings quoted might either have been passed over in silence, or quoted only to be condemned. At v. 61 van Leeuwen's

οὐδ' αὖθις ἀσελγανοῦμεν εἰς Εὐριπίδην,

and at v. 155 the reading

φύλαττί θ' ὅπως μὴ τὴν βάλανον ἐκτρώξεται

both ought to be put out of court by the break between the two short syllables of an anapaestic foot.

The scene vv. 136-229, as arranged by Mr. Graves, requires four speaking actors. It seems probable, however, that Bdelycleon, when he utters v. 138

οὐ περιδραμεῖται σφὼν ταχέως δεῦρ' ἄτερος;
is still off the stage. Sosias then runs 'δεῦρο,' that is, off the stage, and to Xanthias at v. 142 is assigned the charge of watching the door. After a short pause the actor who has been playing Sosias pops his head out of the chimney as Philocleon. Meanwhile Xanthias on the stage continues to watch the door, and it is he, not Sosias, who says at v. 152 ὅδε τὴν θύραν ὀθεῖ. To which Bdelycleon replies *πίεξε νῦν σφόδρα*,

and promises to come to his assistance. Lines 202-210 should be assigned to Xanthias and Philocleon, as they are by Dindorf. In this way the whole of the scene can be managed by three speaking actors, and there is no place in the play where more than three are required. I think Sosias nowhere appears after v. 138. Mr. Graves thinks that he appears in the trial scene (vv. 891 *sqq.*) as a *κωφὸν πρόσωπον*, but there is no evidence of this.

On v. 151

ὅστις πατὴρ νῦν Καπνίου κεκλήσομαι

Mr. Graves observes 'The joke on *κάπνη* or *καπνός* is obvious, but its further point is not so clear. A rough-tasting wine, or the vine producing it, is said to have been called *καπνίας*, but this line very likely originated the idea. It seems plain that calling a man *καπνός* was a gibe of the day, see 325, and this may be all that is meant. The scholiast says that Epphantides, an old comic poet, was nicknamed *Καπνίας*, "old smoky," when dull and stupid. Rogers supposes that some disreputable Athenian named Capnias may be intended.'

It seems to me that *καπνίας* is a natural enough word to describe wine of a particular flavour, and that it is quite unnecessary to suppose that this line originated the title, and rather hard to see how it could. *Καπνίας οἶνος* is mentioned by Aristophanes' senior, Pherecrates, and that the epithet was already used of a kind of wine is clear from vv. 325-6, where we are told that Aeschines, who is *καπνός*, is (no true *κάπνιος ἀμπελος* but) a *ψευδᾶμάρεξ*. Nor can I believe with Mr. Rogers that *Καπνίας* was the real name of an Athenian. The gibe imputes a combination of real meanness with pretended grandeur. It is given to a man who brags, ('gasses' some would say now), about his castles in Spain—or in Thessaly (v. 1246). Compare the Latin *fumum vendere*. The notion of dulness or murkiness in a poet has nothing cognate with the situation; so, though the scholiast may be right about Epphantides, it is unlikely that he is referred to here. Two persons nicknamed *κάπνος* or *καπνίας* at this time are mentioned in this play; Proxenides at v. 325 and Aeschines vv. 325, 459, 1220, and 1246. The great probability is that it is one of these two men who is here (v. 151) referred to. Aeschines appears to be a demagogue, from the company in which we find him in v. 1220. He is the son of 'Sellus,' that is of a mendicant impostor. At line 459 we have Sellus

comically expanded into Sellartius, where the second element probably is *āpros*, bread; though it is just possible that it may contain a reference to the real name of Aeschines' father, whatever it was. Was it worth while to commemorate, as Mr. Graves does on v. 459, the scholiast's notion that Sellartius is connected with *σέλας*?

At v. 1267 we have a mention of Amynias, who, as Mr. Graves says in his note on v. 1265, had wasted his substance by luxury and gambling. His note on v. 1267, ἀλλ' Ἀμυνίας ὁ Σέλλου μᾶλλον οὐκ τῶν Κρωβύλου, runs thus: 'Amynias was really the son of Pronapes (75) and is here called son of Sellus, to show that he was a brother καπνός of Aeschines.' But the cases of Aeschines

and Amynias were totally different; they were 'brothers' in no sense. Aeschines was born poor and bragged of wealth he never had; Amynias was born rich but spent his money, and there is no evidence that he ever bragged of possessing wealth after he had lost it. I believe that μᾶλλον is here used (as μᾶλλον δὲ is more usually) as a corrective. The poet having in mind Amynias' destitute condition, by a pretended slip of memory, ascribes to him a beggarly origin, a mistake which he immediately corrects. Understanding σκαῖος ἔδοξε we get the meaning: 'but (I can't say so much for) Amynias, the beggar-born—no, I beg his pardon, one of the race of the ancient Top-knot.'

E. S. THOMPSON.

STRACHAN-DAVIDSON'S CICERO.

Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic, by J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. 'Heroes of the Nations' series. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. 1894. 5s.

It is with sound judgment that Mr. Strachan-Davidson has described Cicero as a hero of the Roman Republic. Cicero believed that a 'Free State was the only form of government worth having' and died a martyr to that confession. This must lead us to form a judgment of Cicero very different from that which the ponderous learning of Drumann and the passionate genius of Mommsen have made fashionable. Mr. Strachan-Davidson says it is impossible to escape from the influence of the latter great scholar: it is certainly difficult, such are his learning and lordly power, but Mr. Strachan-Davidson has escaped it; and with deep sympathy for one who revered his conscience as his king, and with a strong love of freedom, he has written in an exceptionally charming style an *Ehrenrettung* of Cicero the politician which serves to place him in his proper position as the faithful servant and defender of the Roman Republic in the last days of her existence. In a truer sense than either Brutus or Cassius was Cicero the last of the Romans.

To describe all the excellences of the work would be an endless undertaking; but some especially suggestive discussions may

be mentioned. Mr. Strachan-Davidson points out the absence of organized 'party' at Rome in Cicero's time except among the revolutionary faction, and shows that it was as individuals rather than as party supporters that men were advanced to office (92). Nothing could be better than the contrast between the projects of the impatient, shortsighted Catiline, 'who did not draw the sword before he blew the horn,' and the patient, far-seeing Caesar (117-9). Very true also is the psychological contrast between self-conceit—obstinate, perverse and a sign of weakness—and the exuberant and innocuous peacock-like vanity of mere loquaciousness, which may exist with true greatness of character (193). It might have been added that the latter quality, though not the former, is generally found with almost complete absence of jealousy; and we think that Mr. Strachan-Davidson has failed to emphasize with sufficient force this beautiful trait in Cicero's character. Very different were the majority of the Roman nobles and their natural leader, Pompey. Again, Cicero's personal loyalty to his friends, e.g. Sestius, Flaccus, should have received more recognition, especially as Pompey's faults in that respect meet with well-deserved castigation (265). It is pointed out with all possible detail (105, 260, 274) that it was the constant effort of Cicero to effect the natural union between Pompey and the body of nobles; that the latter, like true oligarchs, were suspicious

and jealous of one another; and that yet Cicero, well knowing all Pompey's faults and meannesses, was yet instinctively drawn to him even to the last by an irresistible attraction—'ein dämonischer Zug,' as Weidner puts it.

With genuine poetical feeling does Mr. Strachan-Davidson point out the tragedy of Cicero's political life: the union of Pompey and the nobles was at last effected when it was too late and Caesar was already marching on Rome (321); 'the union of the orders' and the 'consent of Italy' were realized at the very end when the Republic had only raw recruits as defenders and well-trained veterans as opponents (406). And it is with true feeling for Cicero's character, who even more than Caesar had much in his soul besides the statesman, that Mr. Strachan-Davidson adduces as an effective reason for Cicero's joining the triumvirs in 55 the fear that, if he did not join them, he would compromise the fortunes of his brother Quintus (208); and that he asks us to reflect how proud a moment it must have been for Cicero when he could say officially to the senate 'the legion which was commanded by Lucius Piso, one of Antony's lieutenants, has gone over to my son Cicero and placed itself at his disposal' (390). The true reason why Pompey joined Caesar in 60 is doubtless that given by Mr. Strachan-Davidson (206) viz. that he did not think Caesar was a military genius or would ever dream of carrying out his political designs by an armed force; why, not even in 51 did the nobles or Cicero think it. The discussion on the religious veto and its origin is excellent, not merely in statement of fact but also by reason of the delightfully cynical account of the way in which the Romans 'manufactured good luck' (211). Highly ingenious too is the explanation given of the fact that the violence of vituperation is much less in modern times than in ancient Rome, viz. that a powerful restraint has been put upon the spoken word by the practice of duelling (257). Mr. Strachan-Davidson thinks (411) that the Liberators were short-sighted in not waiting for Caesar's death in the course of nature, and perhaps then the army, like that of Cromwell, would have passed over to the legitimate government. They doubtless would have replied to such a suggestion that if they waited Caesar would have time to train a successor. However it is for the thorough insight into Cicero's character that we must be most grateful to Mr. Strachan-Davidson. He holds that Cicero

had a sound conscience which was perplexed by too subtle an intellect. When he perceived his duty plainly he boldly and unreservedly faced it; but he generally saw so many sides of a question that he was unable to decide quickly as to what course to pursue (426). It might have been added that it was mainly this characteristic,—which was a defect in Cicero regarded as a practical politician,—that combined with his great gift of language to make him pre-eminent as an advocate, and as a popularizer among the Latin nations of the many-sided philosophy and culture of the Greek world.

The character of Pompey too, who 'considered himself a privileged person' (42), is sketched with great insight. He certainly had not 'the vulgar ambition to make himself a despot' (87); and we do not believe that in the proposal of Messius (248) Pompey had any further motive than the desire to be as fully equipped as possible in order to carry out the work he had to do speedily and effectively. There was nothing Pompey liked so much as doing an easy thing with great *éclat*. He quite wished to be loyal to the state, he did not dream of military tyranny, and we think that the nobles knew it; Cicero certainly knew it (*Rull.* ii. 62). This gives a satisfactory reason why they always treated Pompey with such mean jealousy and frustrated his legitimate demands for grants of land for his soldiers. But we fail to see the drift of Mr. Strachan-Davidson's persistent attacks (167, 347—351) on Caesar's military despotism as an evil. Of course it was an evil, but a lesser evil than the continuance of the senatorial government. Against whom are these attacks directed? If they are meant for Caesar's modern flamen, Mommsen, they but reflect what he has said with all the emphasis in his power in one of the most celebrated passages of his *History* (iv. 466—7 E.T.). And there is something further. The Empire had to be organized. It is only by despotism, under whatever form it may be veiled, that deliberate organization can be effectively carried out on a large scale. As well blame our government of India as blame Caesar's government of the Empire or any other order of discipline to which human beings are compelled to submit in order that their development may be more steady or their process of decay less painful. Nor can we altogether agree with the views maintained of Caesar's proposal in the matter of the Catilinarian conspirators (141 ff.). Excitement ran high; but Caesar kept his head

and made a proposal that was undoubtedly within the law, which was perhaps unduly tender to the Roman citizen, but still the law. The apparent severity of that proposal is to be explained by the fact that nothing lenient would have been listened to for a moment: but of course Caesar knew that, once the excitement was over and the conspiracy finally crushed, the conspirators would at least be given a fair trial; for he knew that the final overthrow of the conspiracy was but a question of time now that the conspirators at Rome were arrested, whether they were executed or not.

We regret that we do not hear more about Cicero's private life: also that so little is said about Cicero's encouragement of, and kindly feeling towards, young men, and his relations with the brilliant Curio. Marcus Brutus too receives scant recognition. Mr. Strachan-Davidson might have taken heart of grace and acknowledged the genuineness of most of the Epistles to Brutus, now that even Meyer has struck his colours. Some mistakes of a very trifling nature have been made, e.g. the senator with whom Catiline placed himself was M. Metellus, not M. Marcellus (123). The account followed in the narrative of the deaths of Quintus and his son (80) is that of Appian (iv. 20) not that of Dio Cassius. *Negotiator* is rather 'money-

lender' than 'trader.' The letter to Trebi-
anus (*Fam.* vi. 10) mentioned on p. 355 belongs to the autumn of 46, not to the beginning of 45. There is a slight inconsistency in what is stated as to Cicero's desire for the augurate on p. 218 and p. 290. On p. 49 for 'path' read 'way of glory.'

The translations (which are rightly numerous) are of such a perfect nature that it would require a Cicero to praise them, e.g. *fautrix suorum regio* 'this clannish land of ours' (8); *aqua haeret* 'there is a stoppage in the current of my action' (266); *desiderio pristinae dignitatis* 'from a sense of the aching void left by the loss of my old independence' (358). Perhaps 'impressionableness' is a better word for *mollitiam* than 'fluidity' (197); *valde bella* (195) is rather 'quite charming' than 'mighty fine'; and we altogether object to 'piracy' as a rendering of *latrocinium* (128, 258): 'pirate' is confined properly to a robber on the high seas.

The work is enriched with many pictures of places and people (mostly from Duruy) and of coins (from Cohen and Babelon). There is a map to illustrate the War of Mutina, and a copious index. In truth a book 'omnibus numeris absolutus.'

L. C. PURSER.

FREESE'S TRANSLATION OF ISOCRATES.

The Orations of Isocrates, translated by J. H. FREESE, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Introduction and Notes. Vol. I. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1894. 5s.

ISOCRATES, it is believed, has never yet been translated into English; and Mr. Freese may be congratulated on the clear field thus opened to his labours. Like the best of the Bohn series, and notably C. R. Kennedy in his Demosthenes, he has produced something much better than the ordinary 'crib'; a version at once literal enough to afford a model for students, and readable enough to attract the English reader, now supposed to be more intent than formerly upon the masterpieces of ancient literature. The present volume contains the first ten orations, including the important political pamphlets *Panegyricus*, *Philippus*, *Archidamus*, *Areo-*

pagiticus and *On the Peace*, but not extending to the *Antidosis* or the still more interesting six forensic speeches. Nearly half the volume (as far as § 70 of the *Philippus*) had been translated by Mr. A. H. Dennis of Exeter College, Oxford, who was prevented by professional engagements from carrying out his plan. His MS. was handed over to Mr. Freese, who has revised and completed it, and has added the Introduction and Notes. These, it must be admitted, are somewhat thin in character, but criticism is to some extent disarmed by the candid confession that they are intended mainly for English readers. In the second volume we are promised some Appendices dealing with the Athenian constitution and other matters; when it is to be hoped that the writer will aim at a more solid contribution to scholarship. We have read the notes throughout, and have compared Mr. Freese's English

with the Greek in the three speeches *Panegyricus*, *Philippus*, and *Areopagiticus*. The general result, as has been said, is highly satisfactory: we have noted some few points as needing correction.

Paneg. § 126 οὐχ ὡς ἐκείνον πλέομεν ὥσπερ πρὸς δεσπότην ἀλλήλων κατηγορήσοντες; Mr. F. gives a figurative sense to πλέομεν, and translates: 'Are we not drifting into his hands as into those of a master, ready to blame each other for the result?' The meaning surely is: 'Do we not sail to him (i.e. send embassies) as to a master, in order to accuse one another (as before a judge)?' Isocrates is describing the abject attitude of the Greeks in general towards the Persian king after the Peace of Antalcidas. § 151 ἐξεταζόμενοι πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς βασιλείοις, 'searched on entering the palace,' is expanded into 'they are subjected to inspection on the very threshold of the royal palace.' Besides its diffuseness, this translation emphasizes the wrong part of the sentence. § 153 ἑτέρον τοσούτου χρόνον is not 'for twice that length of time' (which would be sixteen months) but 'for as long a period' (viz. eight months). § 180 καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος 'concerns the whole of Hellas.' Rather 'is directed against the whole of Hellas.' § 187 τὴν δ' εὐδαιμονίαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην διακομίσσασιν: εὐδαιμονία is here 'wealth,' not 'happiness' as Mr. F. translates. *Phil.* § 5 εἰς οἷόνπερ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Κυρηναίους ἀπέκισαν 'such as the place to which the Lacedaemonians have removed the Cyreneans.' The reference is not, as the note states, to the planting of

colonies from Cyrene, but to the colonization of Cyrene itself by the Lacedaemonians. § 80 κοινὸς is translated 'accessible to all.' It may be rendered in one word, 'impartial.' § 130 For 'whom I hope will be best able to do so' read 'who I hope' &c. § 152 'Having practised upon them, gained experience, and come to know what manner of man you are.' This would be a rendering of γνωὺς οὖτος εἰ, if self-knowledge were intended: the Greek is γνωσθεὶς οὖτος εἰ, and the meaning 'recognized for what you are.'

Areop. § 38 the notes require revision: the age of the Ephebi and the explanation of ἐπὶ δῖερες ἡβήσαι are not given according to the latest authorities; and the Areopagus was not called ἡ ἄνω βουλὴ 'as holding its meetings on the hill,' but as enjoying an honorary precedence like 'the Upper House.' § 46 Καὶ ταῦτα νομοθετήσαντες οὐδὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ὠλιγόρουσι: 'And while they made these regulations they did not neglect the future' is not a happy rendering, suggesting as it does that τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον is accusative after ὠλιγόρουσι. Of course αὐτῶν must be supplied: 'they did not neglect them later on.' § 58 συνέδρους καὶ συγγραφείας 'committees and boards.' The former word may pass muster; the συγγραφεῖς were commissioners with full powers (αὐτοκράτορες) to draw up a new constitution, Thucyd. viii. 67.

We had marked the following passages as examples of Mr. F.'s best style: *Paneg.* § 185, *Areop.* §§ 37, 53. But we must abstain from giving extracts.

W. WAYTE.

HOESS ON THE STYLE OF ISOCRATES.

De ubertate et abundantia sermonis Isocratei observationum capita selecta scripsit
GUILIELMUS HOESS. Friburgi Brisigaviae
ex officina C. A. Wagneri MDCCCXCII.
Pp. 56.

THIS is a statistical investigation, undertaken at the suggestion of Otto Hense, of the tautological use of synonyms by Isocrates of which Dionysius of Halicarnassus speaks *de Isocr.* c. 3, ὥστ' ἀνάγκη παραπληρώμασι λέξεων οὐδὲν ὀφελουσῶν χρῆσθαι καὶ ἀπομυκνέειν πέρας τοῦ χρησίμου τὸν λόγον, and again τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἐν τῷ περιττῷ τιθεμένου. That Isocrates chooses his words with care and shows discrimination in the use of words

almost but not quite identical in meaning has been pointed out and illustrated by Dr. Blass (*Att. Bered.* ii.¹ 125 sq.), who agrees with Kyprianos in seeing here the influence of Prodicus. But it is also true that Isocrates (who is imitated in this by Demosthenes and by Latin writers) frequently, for the sake of rhetorical effect, uses two or more expressions where one would have sufficed. Thus, as Hoess points out (p. 13 sq.), sometimes the same thought is expressed both affirmatively and negatively, as in xvi. 44 οὐδ' ἀναγκασθεὶς ἀλλ' ἐκῶν, sometimes two or more synonyms are joined by καὶ (or οὐ—οὐδέ, μὴ...μηδέ) or less often ἀσυνδέτως, as in xii. 264 ἐπὶ γόνον, ἐξήλουν,

ἐμακάριζον, sometimes words scarcely differing at all in meaning are joined by ἢ or by καὶ ...καὶ, οὔτε...οὔτε, μήτε...μήτε, as in v. 136 καὶ τὴν στρατείαν ποιῆσθαι ταύτην καὶ πολεμεῖν καὶ κινδυνεύειν, sometimes again a word like καλὸς or μέγας is followed by one of narrower meaning, as in vi. 32 μαρτύρια μείζω καὶ σαφέστερα.

Hoess has made a complete collection of all such instances as occur in the Isocratean 'corpus,' giving separate lists of substantives, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs for each oration and epistle, and adding a table showing the total number of instances. There is of course room for much difference of opinion as to whether a particular word or phrase should be regarded as redundant, but Hoess has chosen his instances with care, availing himself of the investigations of H. Schmidt in his *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. The collection will therefore be of value to all students of Greek synonyms.

But Hoess has made a further use of his results. He regards the relative frequency of synonyms as a norm of style which may serve as a subsidiary aid in fixing the date of publication of certain orations and in deciding as to the genuineness of doubtful works. He therefore fixes the dates of the orations as exactly as possible, following in the main Dr. Blass's *Attische Beredsamkeit* ii.², and then shows how far his statistics serve to confirm these dates. The table on p. 43 shows that Isocrates made but slight use of these synonyms in his earlier works, that he used them with greater frequency in his middle and best period, and that they are found most abundantly in his latest works.

An example or two will make Hoess's method of proceeding clear. The date of

the *Helena* (Or. x.) is, as is well known, a matter of dispute. While Blass (*l.c.* p. 122) regards it as one of the earliest works of Isocrates, Professor Jebb, whose careful discussion of this point is not referred to by Hoess, thinks it may probably be put about 370 B.C. (*Attic Orators* ii.¹ pp. 102 sq.), and Keil (*Anal. Isoc.* p. 8) dates it *circ.* 365 B.C. Now the synonym test points to a date not only later than the *Busiris* (before 380) but also later than the *Plataicus* (374-372). Hoess therefore dates it (p. 47) 'certe non ante a. 370,' though he had previously (p. 6) on other grounds said that it was written 'paulo ante ol. 100 (380).' Again, as to the date of the *Archidamus* (Or. vi.) opinions differ widely, Blass (*l.c.* p. 263) placing it after 356, while Professor Jebb refers it to 366, and Keil to 365 B.C. Hoess prefers the earlier date and sees a confirmation of it in the small number of synonyms as compared with the latest orations.

The question of the genuineness of the *Ad Demonium* and of the *Letters* is discussed by Hoess at some length. He is convinced that the former is not the work of Isocrates, though he seems to have overlooked the *De Isocratis Demonicea* of Ponickau (noticed in the *Classical Review* iv. p. 422). On the other hand he considers that the question of the genuineness of the *Letters* needs a far more thorough investigation than it has yet received. The ninth letter he declares to be undoubtedly spurious (p. 7), but does not venture to give a decided opinion as to the others. And indeed, as all the letters are accepted by Blass as genuine and rejected by Keil as spurious, we may well agree with Hoess that 'adhuc sub iudice lis est.'

HENRY CLARKE.

HULTSCH ON THE TENSES OF POLYBIUS.

Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios, ein Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache, von FRIEDRICH HULTSCH. Leipzig, 1891-1893. S. Hirzel. 11 Mk.

THE learned editor of Polybius has set himself the task of illustrating that writer's use of the historic tenses, and with characteristic industry has collected some six thousand instances which he endeavours to reduce to their proper categories. He forcibly points out that the interest and value of the

language of Polybius consist in the fact that he heads the list of the writers of the common dialect (κοινή). The later writers of Greek in the imperial age attempted to recall the grace and elegance of the Attic of the best period, but only sacrificed vigour and life. Polybius, the practical statesman, sought the ground-work of his style in the living speech of his time, and was acceptable to his contemporaries in proportion as he was intelligible. It is easier, as Hultsch remarks, to note the differences in the language

of Polybius from the Attic than to form a comprehensive view of the principle underlying it; and it is this latter that he has attempted to do. He therefore goes to the root of the matter, adopting the logical division of G. Curtius between the time-period (*Zeistufe*) and the time-mode (*Zeitart*) of a tense. By the former an action is indicated as past present or future, by the latter as accomplished, continuing, or beginning. And he lays it down as a preliminary formula that by the imperfect indicative an action is conceived as continuous, by the aorist as transient (*dauerlos*). But the use of the one or the other (though not uninfluenced by objective rules) depends mainly on the subjective judgment of the writer. Consequently verbs which in themselves involve an idea of duration will mostly be found in the imperfect,—as for instance, in military matters *ἄγειν*, *προάγειν* and other verbs of going, starting, and sending are often found in the imperfect where the aorist might have been expected; those that involve the idea of suddenness or brief duration will mostly be found in the aorist. After devoting three sections to a dissertation on the three kinds of imperfections—of duration, of development, of description—and their interconnexion, he treats the case of verbs of attempting and undertaking, such as *διδόναι* in the sense of 'to offer,' *πείθειν* of unsuccessful advice, *πειρᾶσθαι*, *ἐγχειρεῖν* and the like; and next shows by a comparative table of imperfections and aorists how the former predominates in connexion with adverbs or adverbial expressions. Similar lists are given of verbs of demanding and exhorting, as, *ἀξιοῦν*, *παραινεῖν*, *παρακαλεῖν* (p. 109, 110); and of sending or dispatching (p. 120—122); and of numerous others. Though the instances are all but exclusively taken from Polybius, these two hundred large pages (§§ i.—xxii.) contain really a most valuable treatise on the use of the aorist and imperfect applicable to Greek generally. The second part (§§ xxiii.—xxx., pp. 179) treats in a similar manner the interchange of the imperfect and aorist, starting with an exhaustive examination of the usages of the verbs, *γίνεσθαι*, *ἔχειν*, *λείπειν*, *μένειν*, *φείγειν* and *βάλλειν*, with their compounds. In § 28 the use of the aorist to express continuance for a definite space followed by change of the action conceived, as in *ἐπέμεινε τρεῖς ἡμέρας* (21, 43, 9), *πολὺν μὲν χρόνον ἠπόρησαν* (1, 10, 3), is illustrated at some length, as well as the prevailing use of the aorist with certain adverbs, as *τέλος*.

Finally, Hultsch gives a list of verbs whose aorist and imperfect tenses have the same form in the third person singular, as *ἐγείρειν*, *κλίνειν*, *κρίνειν*, *κτείνειν*, *πραίνειν*, *διαφθείρειν* and others, the time-value of which therefore has to be settled by the context. In § 29 he further illustrates the variation of the use of the imperfect and aorist by examining in detail certain descriptive passages, such as for instance the account of the battle of Cannae (3, 113—116), which he speaks of as *ein stilistisches Meisterwerk*, and points out the delicate shades of meaning expressed by the respective uses of aorists and imperfections in the words: *ἐκίνα—παρενέβαλε—ἐξέταττε—κατέσκησε*. He gives moreover a long list of phrases in which the aorist and imperfect occur in clauses joined by *καί* or by the particles *μέν* and *δέ*, when a similar difference in the meaning is required. This is farther illustrated by contrasted clauses in § xxx.; and he then goes on in §§ xxxi. and xxxii. to discuss and illustrate the uses of the historic present and pluperfect. The historic present is naturally of much rarer occurrence in descriptive passages than the imperfect and aorist, the proportion in the first book being about one to sixty, and somewhat lower still in the following four books, and in the fragments less frequently by about a half than in the first five books. As to this Hultsch remarks that as Polybius occupied many years in the composition of his work, and consulted a large variety of authorities, some variation of style between the beginning and end of his history was to be expected. But neither in his use of the historic present nor in that of the pluperfect does he differ materially from the usage of his predecessors; and the most valuable part of the last section is the list of passages in which clauses are found joined by *καί*, *μέν...δέ*, *τε...τε* and other conjunctive or disjunctive words, containing respectively a pluperfect and imperfect. As the three parts of the treatise were printed originally in the transactions of the *philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, the pagination is not consecutive, but a fairly good index at the end of the third part helps to obviate any difficulty which might be caused by this. There can be no doubt that by his laborious, and it is to be feared unremunerative, work the author has earned the gratitude of students of Polybius and of Greek generally.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

HARDY'S CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT.

Christianity and the Roman Government, by
E. G. HARDY, M.A. London. 1489. 5s.

MR. HARDY'S interesting little volume is, like many other recent bits of writing, an outcome of Prof. Ramsay's stimulating book upon *The Church in the Roman Empire*. But it is to Mommsen's article 'Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht' that Mr. Hardy is chiefly indebted for his point of view, which may be thus summed up in his own words (p. 101): 'Christianity by virtue of its inherent disobedience (*obstinatio, παράταξις*) was a criminal offence, but in the eyes of the police administration, not of the law.' And on p. 90 he argues that 'when repressive measures were taken, they would be taken usually, not from any "*Flavian policy*" (i.e. general instructions given to provincial governors to put down Christianity), not because membership in the sect was looked upon as treasonable by the government, certainly not because the Church was looked upon as "*an organized unity dangerous to the state*," but in consequence of some manifestation of hostile feeling on the part of the populace.'

This criticism of Prof. Ramsay (whose are the words italicized) is probably true of the period ending about 250 A.D., but surely not after that. However this is a minor point, and his readers have reason to thank Mr. Hardy for the clear and cogent way in which he brings out many points, e.g. that the Church was not persecuted in Bithynia or elsewhere because it was an illicit collegium; that torture was, primarily at least and in theory, applied to Christians in order to induce them to recant and save themselves from the death-penalty; that the obligation to sacrifice to the Emperor's image was a mere test to determine whether men were truly Christians; that the Roman authorities, during the first two centuries

at any rate, rather reined in than not the very intelligible fury and rage which the new religion excited in the breasts of men and women in general. Had the populace been allowed to have their way with the religion from the first, it would hardly have survived.

Mr. Hardy thinks that the whole of the charge against the Christians was from the first persecution under Nero onwards simply and solely that of hatred of the human race, 'odium generis humani.' 'They were potentially outlaws and brigands and could be treated by the police administration as such, whether in Rome or the provinces.' He cannot therefore agree with Prof. Ramsay that the Flavian emperors introduced any new principle of punishing the mere profession of the name of Christian. That name simply denoted the bearer's mischievous tendencies.

In an appendix Mr. Hardy reprints the Acts of the martyrs of Scili and the Acts of Apollonius. He accounts for the action taken by the Senate in the latter trial by supposing that the martyr was a senator. This Mommsen in a recent paper read before the Prussian Academy denies. The circumstance, which I noticed in republishing these Acts, that the Armenian MSS. name Tarruntenus and not Perennis as the prefect in charge of the case, has not been considered either by Mommsen or Harnack in their arguments against and for the senatorial rank of the accused. Yet it must surely bear upon it, besides putting the date of the martyrdom two or three years earlier.

Mr. Hardy's book may be warmly recommended to all who desire a guide to the intricate question of the origin and nature of the earlier persecutions. It is a pity that no index of contents is supplied.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

TWO BOOKS ON HORACE.

Scholium Antiquum in Q. Horatium Flaccum, Vol. I. Porphyrii Commentum recensuit A. HOLDER. Ad Aeni Pontem, sumptibus et typis Wagneri. MDCCCLXXXIII. 20 Mk.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, Philologische Untersuchungen von G. FRIEDRICH, Gymnasialoberlehrer zu Schweidnitz. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1894. 6 Mk.
NO. LXXVI. VOL. IX.

THE first of these two books is a most careful and admirably printed edition of Porphyrius's commentaries according to the text of the *Codex Vrsinianus* (*Vaticanus* 3314), which the editor carefully collated during October and November 1887, and which he assigns to the ninth century. All variations from the actual text of the MS. are accurately marked, any letters which are

added, removed, or corrected being clearly indicated, and various readings and emendations being given at the foot of the page, while an elaborate index of more than 100 pp. makes the book most useful for reference. As it stands the work is indispensable to all advanced scholars, but even for them it would be improved—and it is the only improvement needed—if the editor had prefaced his work with some observations on the value which those who consult them may reasonably attach to Porphyry's comments and on the authority which his evidence as to a reading possesses.

A well-known instance will show that some guidance is needed. In *Od.* 1, 20, 10 his reading is *tu uiuis uiuam*, but *Sat.* 2, 2, 48, commenting on the words *Infamis*. *Quid?* *Tum*, he writes '*Figura nota apud H. transeundi ad aliam rem . . . ut:*

Caecubum et prelo domita(m) Caleno
Tu(m) bibes uua(m),'

where although, as in *domita* and *uua*, the final *m* is not written, yet the context shows that *tum* must be read, while in the note on *Od.* 1, 20, 10 there is no indication whether *tum* or *tu* is intended. Again in the difficult passage *Sat.* 1, 4, 14 (*Crispinus minimo me provocat*) one would be glad to know what is the weight of his testimony to Latin usage when he says that *minimo me digito provocat* is proverbial '*cum volumus quem intelligi tantum valere minimo digito, quantum alium totis viribus*,' because, if his opinion is worth anything, this is a case where we must accept it, or else with Bentley write *nummo*; for the alternative explanation '*lays me long odds*,' though generally received, is impossible, the person who '*lays long odds*' surely '*challenging with a great sum*' and not '*with a very little one*.' But, though in the first of these passages Porphyry has preserved the only possible reading, and also by the spelling of his MS. illustrated the origin of the hopeless *tu bibes*, and in the second passage provides an explanation which is at least probable, still those who accept him as an authority will find themselves often very wrong. What can be said for a man who, in *Ep.* 1, 11, 26 *non maris effusi late locus arbiter*, explains *arbiter* as = *remotus*—'*maris arbiter est locus, qui trans mare longe positus atque discretus est*'—and then adds *potest arbiter et medius in'ellegi?* Or who remarks on *iratis natus paries . . .* that poets were '*accustomed to cover the walls with wax so*

that they might write down on them any idea that occurred to them in the night'? Finally, what real knowledge can a man have who, *Epod.* 17, 52 *utuncque fortis exilis puerpera*, takes *exilis* not as *exsilis* but as *exilis*? Perhaps, however, this last instance might do some good if it could help to show the need of some sane method of Latin spelling. Doubtless in a book of this sort the MS. spelling should be preserved. It is odd enough—first *uiuis* then *bibes*, *furnos* and *fornos* in the same line, *yperbolen*, *lagynae*, *lymfa*, *cumnae*, *celeps*, *Saffo*, *Cantauer*, &c.—but it has a historic and technical interest, while its eccentricities can do no harm. Yet, if a scholar like Porphyry—or Porphyry—can be seduced by a merely ambiguous spelling into such a blunder, it is natural to ask whether the absolute chaos which now prevails as regards Latin orthography is not a grave danger to classical study. By all means let experts, who choose, study the subject. Their labours may ultimately produce some good, and a careful examination of the new *Corpus* proves that they have at any rate established one law, to wit '*that in the Augustan age no two poets spelled alike and no individual poet had any fixed standard of spelling of his own*.' This happy result may amuse cynics or delight the learned, but those who are concerned with classical study as a means of education know that the absence of any common system of spelling in ordinary books is a constant hindrance to their work and productive of no good whatever. The difficulty did not exist thirty years ago when Latin spelling was possibly bad, but at any rate fairly consistent. Now, under an affectation of knowledge, every editor spells as he chooses or as accident dictates, and one more stumbling-block is wilfully placed in the way of classical teaching in all our schools.¹

The second book is eminently interesting. It is a remarkable combination of sound scholarship, acute criticism, and foolish speculation. The writer is one of those scholars who find more in the Odes than is reasonably to be got out of them, but who in the course of their investigation bring out very forcibly many interesting details. Like most critics of this class he takes a special interest in the unknown ladies to whom Horace addresses Odes, and on his

¹ Take these instances from the *Corpus Poetarum*: *Aen.* 3, 173 *agnoscere*, 180 *adgnovit*, 6, 580 *antecum*, 648 *antiquum*; *Hor. Od.* 4, 8, 24 *opstaret*, 9, 43 *obstantis*. Any decent 'reader' would correct such blunders during printing, if only he were allowed.

first page he gives us a very vigorous sketch of Lyde, whose identity in the three Odes addressed to her is so clear that, he says, 'few things can be affirmed with greater certainty,' though how his statement that, after being 'wooed' as a 'coy young maid' by Horace in 3, 11, she becomes in 3, 28 'seine Geliebte' can agree with Nauck's famous description of her there as 'eine fleissige ernstgesinnte haushälterische Schaffnerin,' is a question which no one less versed in such matters than German professors can be expected to decide. On 2, 12, 28, however, he shows sound judgment in preferring the MSS. *occupet* to Bentley's *occupat*, which Schütz defends on the ground that to describe Licymnia as 'letting the same kisses, which she *facili saevitia negat*, be snatched from her and sometimes snatching them herself' is 'nonsense.' 'Yes,' is the reply, 'nonsense undoubtedly, but the charming nonsense of passion. With *rapere occupat* the passage becomes—as happens with most conjectures in Horace—more intelligible and more home-baked (*hausbackener*). So, too, he will have nothing to do with the absurd theories that *magis poscente* (*poscente* abl. abs. Kiessling; = a *poscente* Schütz) do not go together, because to say 'more than you who beg for them' would represent Maecenas as a very cold wooer. He shows by some most interesting quotations how passionately devoted Maecenas was to Terentia, and, after reviewing her relations to Augustus, rightly says: 'As matters stood it must have sounded like music to Maecenas' to hear her passion for him described as greater than his own. Similarly in 1, 6, 28 he rightly rejects both the usual explanations of *sectis unguibus* as either specially 'pared' so as to do no harm or specially 'sharpened' so as to do a deal. The adjective only describes the ordinary carefully trimmed condition of a fashionable beauty's nails (the opposite of Canidia's *irresectum pollicem*), though of course it suggests that the wounds they will inflict in their 'fierce' attack will be only trivial. Surely this is sounder sense than Bentley's appalling *strictis* which he calls *certissima emendatio*.

In 2, 11, 4 *nec trepides in usum* is explained 'and be not slow to enjoy.' Of course *trepidare* is often almost *timere*, and so in Luc. 5, 728 *dubium trepidumque in praelia*, where the context makes the sense certain, the word describes not 'quivering eagerness' but 'trembling hesitation.' Here, however, the context absolutely forbids our taking the word in such a non-Horatian

sense, for *trepides in usum* is carefully opposed to *remittas quaerere* ('slack thy search and be not eager'). Moreover, why should any one show 'trembling hesitation' about enjoying life? 'Trembling hesitation' about going into battle is natural, but with regard to doing something pleasant the phrase is absurd. In the same stanza, however, the difficult *Scythes . . . Hadria divisus objecto* is well explained by the remark that the Adriatic is considered as a shield which is held close to the body (*objecto nobis*, not *Scythia*), though the enemy, as here the Scythians, may be at a considerable distance.

Epist. 1, 20, 19 *cum tibi sol tepidus plures admovent aures*. The school in which the book is being read is out of doors, 'a hedge-row school,' cf. Dio Chrysost. 20, 9, οἱ τῶν γραμμάτων διδάσκαλοι μετὰ τῶν παιδῶν ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς κάθηται, and as the day grows warmer idle loungers come and listen to the schoolmaster, and it is to these gentlemen he is to recite the passage which tells them how the writer is, like themselves, a humbly born, little, irritable, placable, sun-loving fellow.

Od. 2, 18, 29 *Orci fine*, about which editors make so much ado, is clearly shown to be merely the Greek *θανάτου τέλος* reproduced on the principle stated *A. P.* 52 *et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta*. In l. 20 he shows that Peerlkamp's correction of *submovere litora* to *promovere litora* would produce a meaning the exact opposite of what Peerlkamp intended, cf. *Sen. nat. quaest.* 3, 27, 10 of an inundation *jam enim promovet (mare) litus*, 28, 3, *litus prolatum*; but the process of killing conjectures and emendations is like the labour of Hercules against the Hydra.

On *Od.* 1, 15 there is a long discussion to show that this ode is closely connected with the obviously political ode which precedes. Thus the shepherd Paris naturally becomes M. Antony, and Helen is Cleopatra (as Cruquius suggested), Menelaus disappears because the name was commonly used for an injured husband (cf. *Cic. ad Att.* 1, 18, 3), and so could not be applied to Octavian, who therefore is represented by Diomedes, Ulysses is Agrippa, the 'wrathful fleet of Achilles' is the fleet of S. Pompeius, and so on, and so on. It is as clear as daylight. The last line *ignis Iliacas domos* with its well-known metrical difficulty hides a mystic meaning. After nineteen centuries the seer has seen the interpretation thereof. *Ignis* with a final short! Yes, O blind leaders of the blind, but at last there has come a

Gymnasialoberlehrer, who is a teacher indeed. Put an *n* before *Iliacas*, and what then? *Niliacas domos*—‘Rome shall burn the palaces of the Nile.’ No prophecy was ever plainer.

In *Epod.* 9 Bücheler’s view that Horace was present at Actium is rightly accepted, the words *fluentem nauseam* thus obtaining some real force which in old editions they never had, and the hopeless *sinistrorsum* becoming explicable as a pictorial word used by one who had actually just seen the vessel moving off ‘to the left.’ On l. 17 he remarks that ‘all MSS.’ have *frementes* (and not the acc. form *fremētis*) which must therefore go with *Galli*. One would like to know the value of this assertion about *frementes* being necessarily nominative. Common sense almost demands its connection with *equos*.

Od. 3, 19. The scene opens with Horace strolling with some friends who are discussing antiquities, when Horace, who is cold and hungry, suggests that they should dine: as the writer well puts it, ‘nowadays he would have suggested an adjournment to some well-known restaurant,’ but in those days a *δεῖπνον ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν* was the only method. In l. 9 he makes Horace *start* with three bumpers of unmixed wine, for he says the ‘mixing’ first begins in l. 11. Thus he makes Horace begin with pure wine, and then recommend wine mixed with either 75 or 25 per cent. of water. Did ever mortal man drink liquor on such principles? It would be folly for an English editor to refer a German critic to an English edition, for German students of Horace respect nothing but conjectural emendations, and scorn every one but Bentley, but I may perhaps refer to Marquardt ed. 2, p. 335, where the view, which I arrived at independently some time before, is taken—viz. that the ‘rule of 3 or 9’ does not refer to the *proportions* of wine and water, but to the number of *cyathi* taken in each bumper to drink to the various toasts.

Od. 3, 11, 49. He rightly calls attention to the pathos of *dum favet nox et Venus*, used just when the lovers are *parting*, and to the wonderful music of the words *i secundo* . . . with the almost rhyming assonance of *secundo* and *sepulchro*. Has not the remarkable hiatus in *secundo omine*, which no editor notices, also something to do with the charm of these lines?

Od. 4, 11, 2. *Fulges* is probably *future*—‘there is parsley for weaving garlands, and ivy with which you will be able to deck your hair,’ cf. *feroit* in the oldest MSS., *Od.* 4, 2, 7. In *Od.* 3, 8, 5, *utriusque linguae*

refers to Latin and Etruscan, for ‘in what Greek folk-lore would Maecenas find anything about a bachelor keeping the purely Roman *Matronalia*?’ On the other hand, Etruscan ‘tradition’ (*sermone*) was the basis of many Roman ceremonies. *Od.* 2, 13, 7 he proves to demonstration that *robur* is the *Tullianum* to which the conquered chief was led away as the *triumphator* began to ascend the Capitol, on the summit of which he halted *μέχρις ἂν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῶν πολεμίων θάνατον ἀπαγγέλλῃ τις* (Jos. de Bell. J. 5, 6). *Od.* 3, 10 10 *ne currente retro funis eat rota* is of a man pulling up a weight with a pulley, and, on finding it too hard a task, letting the rope go, but the application is not, as most take it, to Lyce, but to Horace, who, as the last lines show, threatens to give up the weary task of wooing her.

The twelfth Ode is described as an elaborate ode to be sung on the marriage of Marcellus and Julia. Starting on this assumption, the writer finds all sorts of hidden meanings in the various names mentioned, e.g. Fabricius and Curius suggest Pyrrhus, Pyrrhus suggests Epirus and the East, and so the reference to Octavian crushing the forces of the East on the coast of Epirus is at once obvious. The curious list of names in the ninth stanza—Romulus, the ‘quiet reign’ of Numa, ‘the haughty fasces’ of Tarquin and Cato’s ‘famous death’—suggests the ideas of ‘fratricide, ignominious repose, tyranny, and civil war,’ and so affords a contrast to the glorious era which is just commencing. Of course it is impossible to reply to such theories. There is undoubtedly in some of the odes a meaning not apparent to the ordinary eye, and scholars from time to time flatter themselves that they have discovered its exact character. But after the lapse of 2,000 years, the elements of uncertainty in such investigations are so great that exactitude is impossible, and those who attempt to fill in the historical background to an ode with too careful detail are in danger rather of marring the effect of the ode itself than of bringing it out in clearer relief. When we conceive the ninth Epode as written at sea immediately after Actium, we at once double our power of understanding it, and similarly in *Od.* 1, 12 the knowledge that it was written for the marriage of Julia and Marcellus would place us in a better position for understanding it, but, even then, it would be folly to inquire exactly what suggestion—if any—Horace intended to convey to Augustus and his court by the mention of ‘Regulus and the Scauri.’

Od. 1, 37, 14, *lymphatam* is not *vano pavore territam*, as in Orelli, but is exactly parallel to *dulci fortuna ebria* and *quidlibet impotens sperare* expressing her 'delirious hopes,' and so in exact opposition to *veros timores*. *Od.* 4, 8, 24, the name *Romuli* is put designedly at the end of the sentence, because Horace wishes to suggest that but for the help of *potentes vates* the very name would have been forgotten. The famous difficulty in 4, 8, 17 is really a joke! The confusion between the two Scipios is designedly introduced to show the importance of not leaving your fame and name to be the sport of vague tradition. In l. 25 of the same ode, *virtus* is connected with *vatum*, a discovery which is not new among us 'remote Britons,' though German editors 'almost unanimously' connect the word with *Aeacum*. *Od.* 3, 18, the festival of Faunus referred to is not that in December, but in February, because the kid born in February could not be 'of a full year' before then! One would like to know why, in face of the fact that this ode is obviously written for the December festival, cf. l. 10 *cum tibi nonae redeunt Decembres*, we are to be compelled to accept the dictum of any editor (e.g. Kiessling) that *pleno haedus anno* go together, or indeed are Latin. But it is foolish to ask questions. Horace knew less about his own works than his critics do.

'Both the last stanzas,' we are told, 'form an almost independent picture, that has very little to do with the poem itself.' After that there is little to be said, and there is only room for regret that a critic so acute as Herr Friedrich shows himself to be, and whose book is one of the ablest contributions to Horatian study made during recent years, should not see that whether an ode was written for the Faunalia of December or February is a matter ludicrously unimportant, but that to say that in an ode of four stanzas two 'have very little to do with the poem' is to convict either the poet or the critic of folly. However, we must do him justice. He will have nothing to do with that famous conjecture of Bentley's 1, 23, 5 . . . *vepris ad ventum*, which a singularly able reviewer (*Oxford Mag.* October 31, 1894) has recently termed 'monstrous,' and for this he deserves credit. But his defence of it is curious. 'It might be objected,' he says, 'that the thought *mobilibus veris inhorruit adventus foliis* is too poetical for Horace. And yet we must not absolutely deny him genuine poetic feeling (*eigentliche Poesie*), though it certainly is shown least of all in the Odes.' Poor Horace! Wisely was he in dread of pedagogues and professors.

T. E. PAGE.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF PROPERTIUS.

(A DISCLAIMER.)

OTHER engagements prevent me from replying to Mr. Housman's article till the April number of the *Classical Review*. In the meantime I wish it to be understood that, neither as it stands nor with the unauthorized alterations of Mr. Housman,

does the passage quoted on p. 27, col. 1, from p. 24 of my pamphlet, represent my views either now, or at the time of the pamphlet's publication.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

PROF. CHRIST ON THE GREEK STAGE.

SCENIC archaeology has been much indebted to Prof. Christ of late, not only for the three Munich dissertations which sprang from his interest in the stage question, but also for his own contributions to the subject.

Beginning with a strong leaning toward the new theory because of its remarkable agreement with the requirements of the extant dramas, he has attempted in a series of investigations to bring order into the chaos of apparently conflicting notices, and to trace the various stages in the development of the Greek theatre from Aeschylus

to Vitruvius. His first article (*N. Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed.* 1894, 27 ff.) was an attempt to define chronologically the successive changes in meaning of the words *σκηνή, προσκήνιον, λογεῖον, θυμέλη*, &c. It is to be regretted that he did not entirely succeed in throwing off the influence of Wieseler in his treatment of the subject. In a few points the prevailing belief has been corrected, but as a whole the work is in no sense final. The ground must be gone over again by one who is willing to know only what our sources teach us, if we are ever to be in a position to explain the statement of Vitruvius or to defend it—for he alone is our authority for a high stage in the Greek theatre. A second article in the *Jahrbücher* (p. 157 ff.) is embodied in the third and most important, *Das Theater des Polyklet in Epidauros in seiner literar- und kunst-historischen Bedeutung* (pp. 1–52 of the Transactions of the Munich Academy for 1894). In this paper Prof. Christ appears as an opponent of the theory of Dr. Dörpfeld, and as the author of a theory of his own. As the first attempt at reconstruction offered by the conservative party, which frankly admits what the opposite side has proved, taking into consideration both the archaeological and literary evidence, this paper deserves careful consideration.

The substance of the argument is as follows: The theatre at Epidauros is essentially in harmony with Vitruvius. The proscenium is a little further back and a little shallower than the Vitruvian, but its dimensions and position identify it unquestionably with the Vitruvian *λογεῖον*. Since Greek theatres of this type were still built in Vitruvius' day and Greek plays still performed in them, it is impossible to reject the architect's statement that this *λογεῖον* was the stage for actors. It cannot be explained as a *θεολογεῖον*, because there was too little need of such a structure. The objections to this *λογεῖον* are that it is too narrow and too high. But it is not too narrow for three to four actors and not too high for the later drama; for the chorus had practically disappeared from the drama after the fourth century. The door in the proscenium proves nothing unless it can be shown that no door existed in the scena on the level of the *λογεῖον*. The proscenium door was useful for non-dramatic performances. No platform was ever built up in front of it. When old tragedies were brought out on such a stage they were remodelled to suit the changed conditions. The Epidaurian proscenium could not have

served as the background of a classical piece because the central door was not large enough for the *eccyclema*. A high stage in the later Greek theatre is attested by vase-paintings, Athenaeus *Mechanicus*, and Pollux.

The theatre at Epidauros, being unsuited to the classical drama, could not have been built by the elder Polycleitus. In unconscious agreement with Dörpfeld, Christ claims it for the younger Polycleitus, dating it *ca.* 300. What then was the form of the theatre of the fifth century? The oldest portions of the Athenian theatre are assigned by Dörpfeld to Lycurgus. But it is impossible to believe that the Athenians were without a permanent theatre for 150 years, and that this was provided only after the highest point of the drama was past. Lycurgus simply enlarged the earlier theatre, making thirteen wedges instead of ten, and possibly extending the *parascenia*. But the scena-buildings of the fifth century were essentially the same as those which we assign to Lycurgus. *τὸ προπίλαιον τὸ Διονύσου* Andoc. *de Mys.* 38, *τὸ τεῖχον* Arist. *Eccl.* 479, *τηδὲ παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν θεόν*, Arist. *Pax* 725 (statue of Athena), and *παρασκήνια* Dem. *Mid.* 17, point to a stone theatre before Lycurgus.

The *parascenia* of the oldest ruins at Athens are 20 m. apart and 5 m. deep. The dramas point to the use of the *parascenia* in scenes where one actor hides from others who stand in their regular position. The usual standpoint of actors was therefore in the space between the *parascenia*. That this place was elevated is proved by *ὀκρίβας* Plat. *Symp.* 194 B and by various passages in the dramas; an elevation for actors is indicated in *Lys.* 288 (*τὸ σιμόν*), in *Vesp.* 1342 and 1514, *Eq.* 149, *Ach.* 732, *Eccl.* 1152 (*ἀνα- and καταβαίνειν*), and in *Av.* 175. This platform must have been 7–8 ft. high to admit of trap-door apparitions. An elevation in the orchestra is indicated by Eur. *Here.* 119, *El.* 489, and *Ion* 727 ff., and *Av.* 20 ff., 49 ff. Since chariots had to enter through the *parodoi* the platform in the orchestra was reached by inclined planes. Actors and chorus were in constant intercourse; therefore the difference in level between them was only about 2 ft., the connection being here also an inclined plane. Steps connected the lower platform with the auditorium. This huge double platform of 120 sq. m., with its three inclined planes and its flight of steps, could have been no temporary structure, though built of wood. It remained from year to year unchanged,

although in exceptional cases the lower platform could be brought up to the level of the higher (thus spoiling the view from the front seats!). It came into use in the last decades of the fifth century. Before that time the chorus stood on the wooden floor of the orchestra, and the actors may have been on a slight elevation.

A multitude of objections to this monstrous stage and thymele suggest themselves. It is a hopeful sign for the defenders of the new theory that Oehmichen and A. Müller have so readily accepted it (*W. Kl. Phil.* 1894, July, and *B. Ph. W.* 1894, 1456). I shall confine myself to a few considerations which seem to me to be fatal to the two assumptions which form the basis of the whole argument: (1) that the Epidaurian proscenium could have been employed as a stage after the fourth century, and (2) that the plays of the fifth century could not have been performed in the orchestra in front of this proscenium. At the outset be it remarked that Christ gives only one explanation of the tremendous change in the height of the stage at the end of the fourth century—harmony. He admits that it must have been very awkward for actors to engage in conversation with the chorus from their 12 ft. elevation. Müller adds (*l.c.* 1459) that the occupants of the higher seats could not easily see over their neighbours' heads what was going on in the orchestra, and that the very high stage was introduced for their benefit. But probably few others who have made the experiment at Epidaurus would agree that an elevation was needed so far as the spectators were concerned. On the contrary, an actor standing between the proscenium and the centre of the orchestra could be better seen and better heard by the majority of the spectators than one who stood on the proscenium.

The chorus had almost disappeared from comedy at the beginning of the third century. But there is strong reason for believing that it continued to exist in tragedy far into the Christian era, and that its intimate relations with the actors were not essentially diminished.¹ Although a characteristic tendency of the later tragedy was to make the songs of the chorus merely *ἐμβόλιμα* (Arist. *Poet.* 18), yet it is wrong to assert on this ground that the participation of the chorus in the action was thereby diminished (Christ, p. 26, 'diese (Zwischenlieder)

¹ This is not the accepted view, but, I believe the correct one. A full statement of the evidence on this point will probably soon appear in the publications of the American School at Athens.

setzen ja keinen Wechselverkehr zwischen Chor und Bühne voraus'). Judging from the later plays of Euripides and by the *Rhesus* one might with more reason assume that, in proportion as the choral songs lost their vital connection with the plot, the greater became in compensation the importance of the chorus in the action. The function of the chorus in Roman tragedy, which was undoubtedly strongly influenced by the contemporary Greek tragedy, makes this more than probable. Satyric plays, in which the chorus always played an important part, continued down into the Roman period. There is no reason to believe that the classical pieces which were reproduced in Greece in the first century before Christ were emasculated by the omission of their choruses, while they flourished in almost their original form on the Roman stage. One cannot imagine that the Sophoclean trilogy with its Satyric after-piece, which was brought out in Rhodes in the first century, was performed without its choruses. Dion Chrysostom, it is true, speaks of the omission of the choral parts of tragedy (*ca.* 100 A.D.), but Welcker long ago has shown that this is not to be understood of the dramatic festivals in the principal cities even at that late period. The proscenium at Epidaurus could not, therefore, have been an actors' stage even after the fourth century. The vase-paintings have been repeatedly shown to have no bearing upon the stage in the Greek type of theatre. The notice of Pollux 4, 127, which implies a permanent connection between orchestra and stage, can also not refer to the Vitruvian Greek stage. The scaling ladders 'such as are placed against the proscenia for the actors,' mentioned by Ath. Mech. 29, are precisely such as the Paedagogue sets in position for Antigone in *Phoen.* 100. They mount from the street (*τρίβος*, v. 93), which passes in front of the palace, to the roof of the house, *i.e.* the top of the proscenium. The wooden ladder was not a permanent or a convenient arrangement, as the context shows.

On the other hand the plays of the fifth century are admirably adapted to the Epidaurian theatre, provided that the actors' place was in front of the proscenium. The objection as to the *ecyclema* is purely imaginary, for the early proscenium was of wood. It can hardly be doubted that the proscenium at Epidaurus is of much later date than the rest of the theatre. The top of the proscenium was not only the *θεολογείον*, but the roof of the house, which

was often called into use. For a perfectly satisfactory explanation of the passages in the drama which indicate an elevation I need only refer to Dr. Bodensteiner's admirable discussion. Prof. Christ's stage would have been impossible for the plays in which a tent occupies the background, of which several were produced after 420, and entirely unsuited to the majority of the plays brought out after this date. Apparitions occur in the plays of Aeschylus as well as in those of Euripides, and yet Christ makes no provision for the former. Too much stress is laid upon the existence of the *parascenia* for hiding scenes. It is noticeable that in all such scenes the person in hiding is able to see everything that goes on before the background (see esp. *Ach.* 239 ff. and *Herc.* 1081 ff.). Therefore the actors did not stand back between the *parascenia*. The only explanation that can be offered of the large *parascenia* in the early theatre is that they were used for the support of the wooden *proscenium* erected between them where the stone *proscenium* stood at a later period.

Prof. Christ's paper is full of minor inaccuracies as regards the theatre ruins. He forgets that the floor of the early orchestra was of beaten clay, and that the mosaic pavement at Athens is of very late date. The search for remains of a tunnel under this pavement, which he repeatedly urges, was made years ago without success. The number of *κερκίδες* in the theatre had nothing to do with the number of tribes. The round stone in the orchestra at Epidaurus was certainly not the *θυμέλη*, though it may have been connected with it. He is not aware that the 'original five steps' of the stage at Megalopolis were long ago given up by their own authors, or that fragments of probably the pre-Lycurgan cavea at Athens have been found. The door in the *scena* on a level with that in the centre of the *proscenium*, such as are found in several theatres, he failed to take into account when he erected his stage over it, 8 ft. above the dressing-rooms. One is surprised to find Mr. Haigh quoted in favour of a 'thymele' in the orchestra 6 ft. high, and Platonius cited to prove the default of the comic choregi in the fourth century, in the face of the explicit statement of Aristotle, *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 56. His rejection of Dörpfeld's dating of the Dionysiac theatre is hazardous, if no better grounds are given. The Romans got along without a permanent theatre for more than 150 years. It is noticeable that *αἱ κύρια ἐκκλησία* were

regularly held in the theatre after the time of Lycurgus, and not before. It is instructive to note that the orators who spoke in these assemblies occupied, not the top of the *proscenium*, but the orchestra. The *προσῦλαιον τὸ Διονύσου* of Andocides was not a part of the theatre, but the entrance to the Dionysus precinct. The *τείχιον* of the *Εκκλησιασῶν* was not necessarily of stone, nor the *παρασκήνια* mentioned by Demosthenes, though the latter may well have belonged to the structure completed under Lycurgus. The assumption of a statue of Athena on the *proscenium* from *Pax* 725 Wieseler has shown to be untenable. It is a noteworthy fact that Demosthenes, in the numerous passages in which he enumerates the great public buildings erected in the fifth century, never mentions the theatre.

EDWARD CAPPS.

The University of Chicago.

Description Raisonnée du Musée de St. Germain-en-Laye. Bronzes figurés de la Gaule Romaine, par SALOMON REINACH. Ouvrage accompagné d'une héliogravure et de 600 dessins. Paris. Firmin-Didot. 1894. 10 fres.

UNTIL quite recently the Berlin *Beschreibung der antiken Skulpturen* was the only example of an official catalogue which aimed at furnishing illustrations of every object contained in the collection described. The catalogue now published by M. S. Reinach of the figured bronzes in the Musée de St. Germain is welcome as the first step towards the fulfilment of Professor Kekulé's prophecy that the exception of Berlin would come in time to be the rule. M. Reinach not only reproduces 600 drawings (190 of which we owe to his own skilful pencil), but in a charming dedicatory letter to M. Bertrand gives a number of practical hints for the production of cheap yet adequate *zincogravure*. Every earnest student will be grateful to M. Reinach for the vigour with which he protests not only against non-illustrated catalogues, but against the eclectic method of illustration, and insists upon the necessity of representing the whole of a collection from its most important down to its apparently most insignificant object. For in the first place, as De Morgan long ago observed, no man's selection of knowledge is ever another man's; and in the second, to quote our author, no one possesses an infallible criterion whereby to determine the value of objects, 'telle statuette qui

n'arrêtera pas un instant le regard d'un archéologue pourra fournir à un autre le point de départ d'une recherche fructueuse.' If only compilers of catalogues would lay this to heart, what precious time would they not save students, by allowing them to know beforehand what to expect of a collection. An illustrated catalogue however cannot be more than a rough guide for those who have not yet seen a collection, or a convenient memorandum for those who have; it cannot take the place of ocular examination or even of photographs. It answers well for objects that have little artistic value and are interesting only as types, but it would be fatal to draw aesthetic conclusions from the caricatured reproduction for instance of the beautiful Blacas warrior (no. 182).

But I am anticipating. Neither the actual catalogue nor the illustrations should cause one to overlook the Introductory Essay in which, in his usual brilliant and incisive style, the author establishes the origin and character of Gallo-Roman art. In accordance with phenomena already partially indicated by Th. Schreiber, he recognizes that Greek influence made itself felt in Gaul mainly through the forms of Graeco-Egyptian art, which were imported not only through Italy, but directly as a consequence of the relations between Graeco-Roman Egypt and the valley of the Rhone. Hence the numerous Alexandrine motifs—negroes, pygmies, children wrapped up in cloaks with pointed hoods, genre caricatures—that meet us at every turn in Gallic art. Hence also (a fact of the highest importance to the student of mythology) the types of the Gaulish gods. The type of 'Dispaten' M. Reinach clearly shows to be borrowed from Sarapis, while the curious crouching or squatting god whose origin has given rise to so much controversy he doubtless rightly derives from the Egyptian Imhotep, in opposition to the current view which seeks his prototype in the crouching god of India. With regard to the whole of this complicated question we miss some reference to the labours of Prof. Rhys (*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion in Celtic Heathendom*, 1888). In his searching analysis of the myth, Rhys, who makes express mention of the *Cernunnos* of Autun (Reinach, no. 177), points out the connexion of the squatting god with the Norse Heimdal the 'god's warder,' 'whose teeth are of gold' (*op. cit.* 'the Gaulish Pantheon,' pp. 78 *sqq.*). The gold teeth, symbol of metallic wealth, and the epithet 'god's warder' seem to prove that we have in

Heimdal and *Cernunnos* the survivors of an older race of gods displaced by a new Pantheon. The old gods are retained partly as servants of the new gods, while, like the dwarfs of the *Nibelungen*, who are an instance of a similar survival, part of their functions is to toil in the bowels of the earth.

The catalogue is agreeably interrupted by a number of *excursus* which take up points already touched upon in the Essay. Especially stimulating is the analysis of the type and the mythology of 'Dispaten,' a full list of whose images is given in the alphabetical order of departments. The mallet or hammer, which is the most constant attribute of this god, Reinach explains on the supposition that 'en général les attributs des dieux sont des fétiches déçus': hence that the *dieu au maillet* was originally a *dieu maillet*, a mallet-god, on the analogy for instance of the axe-Dionysos at Pagasai. We wonder however that M. Reinach does not apply this illuminating theory to the *Jupiter à la roue*, no. 5. If the god with the hammer was the anthropomorphic development of the hammer-god, why should not the god with the wheel represent an original wheel-god? Certainly of the two explanations of the wheel by Gaidoz and Flouest respectively, quoted by M. Reinach, that of Flouest, who sees in the wheel a symbol of the thunder, comes nearest to the truth. This later symbolism gives the clue to the original meaning of the wheel; its rumblings closely imitate those of the thunder; hence it is a popular rain-charm¹ and a potent instrument of sympathetic magic. It may be further conjectured that the nine S-shaped objects which the *Jupiter* carries on a ring slung over his right shoulder were also instrumental in imitating the rattle of the storm. The mallet was doubtless part of the same artillery (cf. however Rhys, *loc. cit.* p. 67).

At every turn of the catalogue interesting points connected with cult and symbolism suggest themselves: thus the numerous votive horses, no. 296 *sqq.*, recall our own 'white horse' in Berkshire, commemorative in popular tradition of a battle between Alfred and the Danes. But the student of art, and of Greek art, will also find the catalogue full of valuable material. I need

¹ Cf. J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, vol. i. p. 21. Mr. Frazer's explanation of the chariot of Krannon, and his remarks on rain charms in general had escaped my memory, both when I wrote the note *C.R.* 1894, p. 175, and when I was preparing the English ed. of Furtwängler's book (cf. *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*, pp. 469 *sqq.*).

only call attention *inter alia* to the charming Hermaphrodite, no. 118, reminiscent of the Kallipygos, as the author points out, and still more of the graceful Satyr looking back at his tail (Vatican, Helbig 371); to the Satyr ἀποσκοπεῖων, no. 113, a bronze of capital importance for the history of art, for it is doubtless an echo of the Satyr of Antiphilos; to the lovely Hypnos, no. 102, after a celebrated Greek original. A fine bust, no. 213, M. Reinach well assigns to the group of Polykleitan heads represented by the Doryphoros of Apollonios in Naples. Most superb of all however is a head with turret crown, no. 91, described as *Génie de Ville ou Cybèle* (Cab. des Médailles). Caylus was most certainly right in refusing to see in this head a Gaulish work; he suggested that it might have been brought from Rome to Paris; its ultimate provenance seems to me more likely to be Greece. It can at any rate have nothing to do with the Renaissance; I should suggest that it was copied from a fine Greek original; the features have the breadth and the seriousness of the fifth century, while the coiffure appears with slight variations on a number of Greek heads of that epoch (with single band, Berlin *Skulpt.* 608, and *J.H.S.* ix. pl. IV., with double band, *Röm. Myth.* Taf. vii. p. 165, fig. 1, etc.). As to the mural crown, which represents a mediaeval castle, the lack of organic connexion between it and the head shows it to be a late barbarous addition (cf. the ring on the head of the fine centaur from Spire, no. 117). A charming section is formed by the vases decorated with reliefs (nos. 394—434), representing scenes for the greater part homelike or idyllic which so clearly attest Alexandrine influence. No. 414 should be especially noted as affording one of the instances, so rare in classical art, of Orpheus playing to the animals.

We must perforce admit with M. Reinach that an 'admiration de commande' for Gaulish works would be quite out of place. Yet, clumsy and unintelligent though the Gauls were as artists or handicraftsmen, it must be owned that they showed themselves appreciative of good work by importing such beautiful objects as the Blacas warrior or the turreted head mentioned above, and by not unfrequently choosing good models to copy or to adapt. The result is that the classical archaeologist can no longer afford to neglect Gaulish art. When he does turn to it he will find no more stimulating or suggestive introduction to the whole subject than M. Reinach's admirable *De-*

scription Raisonnée of the Gaulish figured bronzes.

EUGÉNIE SELLERS.

A. WALTON ON THE CULT OF ASKLEPIOS.

Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. No. III. The Cult of Asklepios, by ALICE WALTON, Ph.D. 1894.

APPEARING as it does under the auspices of a learned society, this is a disappointing treatise. Dr. Alice Walton states quite frankly in her preface that the monograph is a compilation. 'It has been my aim to give in narrative form the results obtained by a careful comparison of material from the different localities, and also to show by means of indexes what material is used.' The indexes of localities, literature, inscriptions, etc., occupy considerably more than a third of the book, and are finished to a perfection truly American, the text itself is abundantly learned, and yet clear and readable, but there the matter ends. Von Wilamowitz has it seems said the last word so far on the intricate cult of the medicine god. Dr. Alice Walton's popular compilation adds no single original suggestion. It will nevertheless be of high use to students. On p. 28 is a discussion of the familiar reliefs with the enigmatic head of a horse in an incuse square. Dr. Walton rightly rejects Le Bas' theory that this represents the 'steed of Thanatos.' She accepts, in lieu of a better, the scarcely more satisfactory theory that the horse recalls the ancient custom of burying favourite animals with their master. Is not a third solution possible? Asklepios came from Thessaly, from Trikkha, the ancient home of the horse-god, peopled by the cavalry race figured mythologically by the Centaurs; he was himself nurtured by a Centaur—was he not at one time a Centaur himself, Asklepios Hippios, and is not the horse's head the surviving symbol, the crest as it were of the ancient half-forgotten cult?

JANE E. HARRISON.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Ancona.—In the piazza Cavour have been discovered six tombs dating from the third century B.C. to Roman times, and showing that the necropolis continued on this site until the latter period. The

remains of several walls, important for the topography of the city, have also been found.¹

Arezzo.—On the site of the potteries *Annua*, *Mennia*, *Rasina*, have been found a number of terracotta fragments belonging to the upper part of a small temple. They include a fragmentary bas-relief with traces of colour, representing a Nereid on a marine monster, carrying a greave (?), probably part of a frieze representing Nereids carrying the arms of Achilles; an *acroterion* with the head of a nymph; fragments of *imbrices*, &c.²

Caltrano Vicentino (Venetia).—A hoard of 365 victoriati, more than half of which belong to the period 228–217 B.C., has been found.¹

Colle del Vallone, near *Paganica*.—Several tombs have been opened, one containing a cinerary urn, the others having served for inhumation. The bodies were placed either on the bare earth, or in wooden coffins, of which the nails and metal corner-pieces only remain. No tomb-stones of any kind were found, nor any coins or objects in bronze, whereas fictile vessels and iron objects were numerous.¹

Montemarciano (Umbria).—A hoard of 208 Republican denarii has been discovered.¹

Montepulciano (Etruria).—The following objects have been found in a sepulchral chamber: a bronze kottabos-stand, 1.30 m. high, with broken iron base, and surmounted by a small figure of the Etruscan *Charun* or *Tuchulcha*; a pair of bronze candelabra capped by a group of a man bridling a horse; several bronze vessels; an iron and bronze brazier on wheels; fragments of an iron spade; and the bottom of a kylix of Orvieto fabric, which dates the tomb about the end of the fourth century B.C.¹

Quartile (Venetia).—A bronze Roman weight of 101.30 grammes, with an inscription EX CA = *ex[actum ad] Ca[storis]*, has been found in a tomb of the Antonine period. Among the objects with it were a leaden weight of 103 gr., early Imperial coins (including one of Antoninus Pius struck for the Lycopolite Nome), some glass, and a singular object (possibly a priapiform lamp).²

Rome.—Reg. III. A fragment of an ancient calendar (part of September and October) has been found, in the course of the continuation of the via de' Serpenti. It belongs to the early years of the reign of Tiberius. Among the festivals mentioned are the *Fontinalia*: [*serie*] FONTI EXTRA PORTAM CAPENAM ?).¹

Reg. VII. In the via Capo le Case has been found a fine male torso, in marble, slightly above life-size.²

S. Angelo in Formis.—A large tile has been dug up, bearing a graffito inscription which reads as follows: N. D. E. C. | *Idibus Julia Celer finger* | *bipedas* XXXXI | *Actum Casilino* | *Modesto II d. Probo cos* | . . . It is a contract for the making of 5031 tiles by a certain date. The date of the document is 228 A.D. The first four letters may stand for *n(omis) dec(embribus)* or for *n(omine) d(ecurionum) c(t) c(olonorum)*.²

Sorrento.—A milestone with the number XXV., and dedicated to the Emperor Maxentius, has been found. It belongs to the road from the promontory of Minerva to Pompei.³

Taranto.—Three mosaic pavements have been discovered, one of which—the only one in Taranto with a representation of the human figure—represents Bacchus, nude, standing to front; with his left hand he leans on a thyrsus, in his right is a cantharus; at his feet a panther. The upper corners

are filled by two amphorae. Most of the design is in black outline, with details in green, blue, &c. The frame of the picture is a row of rectangles (double at the top and bottom) containing rhomboids in which again are inscribed small circles. Lowest of all is a band divided into three parts; the middle one contains three very rudely designed busts; the others are filled each by a double rectangle with semi-circles arranged along the inner sides, a disc in the middle, and lines dividing the field into six small rectangles.³

Verona.—Excavations on the site of the amphitheatre have made clear many details of the building, including especially the course of the subterranean channels, and the substructions of the seats.¹

Verucchio and *Spadarolo* near *Rimini*.—An extensive cemetery of the Villanova type has been systematically examined. It contains a group of very archaic tombs. The cinerary urns are with one exception of very rude fabric, of the shape of a double truncated cone, with lid, and a single handle. They have bands of shallow incised geometrical decoration. The tombs were placed close together, and in a space barely 3 x 4.50 m. were found some thirty tombs, the urns standing one on top of another. In one tomb a skeleton was found, elsewhere the bodies had been burnt. The objects found were mostly of bronze (*fibulae*, armlets, etc.). Among the fictile vessels were (tomb 10) a two-handled vase of black clay, the handles of which were decorated with a row of small whitish circles produced by inlaying rings of shell or bone. Tombs 21 and 46 contained iron daggers. In 52 was a fibula, the spur of which is curved, and has an amber head, while the cord of the bow carries a quadrangular frame with two small horns at one end. In the same tomb was a careful though primitive clay copy of a double-crested helmet similar to the bronze helmets from Tarquinii, with rows of impressed circles alternating with incised lines and rows of triangles. At Spadarolo, among several objects of a similar nature, was found an open-work bronze ornament (?), representing a human figure between two birds; it is of the type frequently found in Etruria, and evidently developed out of the Mycenaean style of ornament described by Evans (*J.H.S.* vol. xiii. pp. 197 ff.). This specimen however stands on a support with a rectangular base, to which is fastened by the hands a small figure. It is suggested that the upper part formed the handle, and the lower a support, of a hemispherical cup, the point of attachment being the rectangular base already mentioned, which is slightly curved.³

GREECE.

Athens.—A small relief of Asklepios, surrounded by four sick persons, has been discovered, together with a mosaic pavement on which is represented a *hippalektryon*.⁴ In the theatre of Dionysus, the subterranean passage by which the actors gained access to the stage, has been found.⁵ The whole of the ground-plan of the temple of Dionysus in Limnae has been laid bare.⁶

Kalauria.—Excavations on this island have resulted in the discovery of the peribolos of the already known Ionic temple. It is 56 metres long by 28 broad. The wall consists of unworked blocks of dark limestone and poros stone. A propylaeum adorned each of the two entrances to the enclosure. Both temple and peribolos belong to the 6th century B.C. A further discovery is that of a stoa built of

¹ *Notizie degli Scavi*, July 1894.

² *Ibid.* August 1894.

³ *Ibid.* September 1894.

⁴ *Athenaeum*, February 9.

⁵ *Standard*, February 14.

⁶ *Athenaeum*, February 16.

polygonal masonry, apparently belonging to the second part of the 5th century B.C.; while another stoa is supposed to have been built by Eumenes II. A propylaeum leading to the square before the temple, a stoa to the west of this propylaeum, and a courtyard surrounded by small rooms are among the other buildings discovered.⁷

Crete.—Halbherr's explorations during the last year have covered two-thirds of the eastern part of Crete. Besides vases, ranging in style from the Thera to the archaic Greek types he has discovered a number of terra-cotta statuettes (some with a peculiar stamp attributed by the finder to the

Eteocretans), and of very archaic steatite stones, incised in some cases with marks bearing on the new theory of a prehistoric script. As to the question of interment in Mycenaean times, the evidence of Erganos is in favour of inhumation, that of other places in favour of burning. Some important sculpture has been found, including a good relief of a dancing girl. There are several inscriptions of importance, both archaic and of later times, including one dated in the reign of Demetrius Poliorcetes, and a Latin rescript.⁸

G. F. HILL.

⁸ *Academy*, January 19.

⁷ *Athenaeum*, January 19.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Vol. xxiii. No. 45. 1894.

Excerpts from Culex in the Escorial MS., Robinson Ellis. Further *Suggestions on the Aetna*, Robinson Ellis. These include notes on the Stabulensian fragment in the National Library of Paris [see *Journ. Phil.* xvi. 292]. *On Herodas*, Robinson Ellis. All arguments in favour of the Alexandrian epoch of Herodas are more or less unconvincing. Prof. Ellis thinks it not inconceivable that Herodas lived later than Catullus and Vergil [see *Cl. Rev.* v. 457]. Critical notes on various passages are also given. *Did Augustus create Eight new Legions during the Pannonian Rising of 69 A.D.*?, E. G. Hardy. Maintains, in opposition to Mommsen, that only four new Legions were raised at this time, and that before the Rising the Roman army numbered at least twenty-two Legions. *Thucydides and the Sicilian Expedition*, W. E. Heitland. Taking Thuc. as our one first-class authority for the history, Mr. Heitland attempts to clear up some obscurities [see *Cl. Rev.* i. 73 and viii. 123]. *Plato, Phaedo* ch. 48, Colin E. Campbell. A criticism on Mr. Archer-Hind's interpretation of this chapter. *ἥδη and ὅθι in Homer*, F. W. Thomas. Maintains that these particles are primarily temporal and refer to some new or critical event just occurring. The only difference between them is that ἥδη is more emphatic, and, as containing ἦ, is almost restricted to the speeches. *On the Text of M. Aurel. Antoninus τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν*, Gerald H. Rendall. Considers that the text of the Meditations is 'singularly susceptible of secure emendation,' of which many specimens are given.

American Journal of Philology. Whole No. 59. October 1894.

William Dwight Whitney, by T. D. Seymour. In his death 'this country has lost one of her most distinguished men, one who had been recognized throughout the world as one of the highest authorities in his department of learning, and who had been for forty years the leader of oriental and linguistic studies in America and the personal master of a majority of the American scholars in his department.' *The Latin Prohibitive*, part ii., by H. C. Elmer. This paper is chiefly devoted to the use of *neque* (*nec*) with the perf. subj., and seeks to show that this construction does not occur as a prohibition (outside of poetry) till the beginning of the period of decline, that the few *ut*-clauses in Cic. continued by *nec*, supposed to be purpose-clauses, are really

result-clauses, while other cases of *nec* with the perf. subj. are really examples of the (so-called) potential subj. and to be translated by 'would' or 'should.' *The Judeo-German Element in the German Language*, by L. Wiener. The Notes consist of *Corrections and Additions to Lewis and Short*, by F. G. Moore and *Brief Notes on Plautus Terence and Horace*, by A. F. West. The passages noted are Pl. Rud. 489–90, Trin. 512, Ter. Heaut. 342, Hor. Od. i. 17, 20, Sat. ii. 6, 79, Epp. i. 1, 2 and i. 7, 72. The only review devoted to classical philology is of the two new Pitt Press editions of Plautus—*Stichus* by Dr. Fennell, and *Epidicus* by J. H. Gray. The reviewer, E. W. Fay, proceeds from the conservative standpoint that the MSS. are a better guide than metrical theories.

Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. January–May 1894. (*Continued from* p. 96).

ON THE LITERATURE OF CORNELIUS NEPOS, by G. Geinss.

I. Editions. *Corneli Nepotis Vitae*, by W. Martens. 3rd edition. Gotha, 1893. Shows much improvement on the last edition and is up to date. *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae*, by M. Giltbauer. Ed. 4. Freiburg-i.B. 1893. Practically the same as the 3rd edition, on which see *Classical Review* vii. 383.

II. Contributions to criticism and elucidation. Lange, N. Jahrb. f. Phil. Some interpretations and emendations. H. Muzik, *Bemerkungen zu Weidners Neposausgabe*. Pr. Krems 1892. Seeks to show that W. has often emended unnecessarily. Next follow some criticisms by the reviewer on Atticus 13, 2 and 3, 2. Vahlen in Herm. xxviii. defends the MS. *omnium* in Epam. 1, 4 where *animi* is generally read.

III. Appreciation of Cornelius Nepos. G. Daichendt, *Die Lektüre des Cornelius Nepos*. Pr. Bistritz 1890. This has especial reference to the Christian standpoint. J. Weissenborn, *Cornelius Nepos in seiner Bedeutung für den Unterricht*. Pr. Aschaffenburg 1892. An excellent work that may be recommended to all.

IV. On the text. H. Muzik has found a MS. of Nepos of the 15th cent. at Gottweil. A collation of the first four lives shows that it belongs to the class MR. Traube, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte römischer Schriftsteller*. Sitzungsber. der philos.-philol.-historischen Kl. der k. bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. 1891. Probos never composed anything but only epitomized existing lives.

V. Dissertations. F. Fügner, *Des Cornelius Nepos Lebensbeschreibungen*. Leipzig 1893. Part I., Text. Part II., Notes. This is the first vol. of school editions of Greek and Latin authors under the supervision of Fügner. Here the notes are rather too long and the vocabulary too short, though it is an excellent edition on the whole. *Cornelius Nepos*. Selected Lives, by P. Dötsch. Leipzig 1894. Part I., Text. Part II., Notes. This also is part of a collection of Greek and Latin authors. It contains nothing that is not important for school use.

ON THE LITERATURE OF LIVY, by H. J. Müller.

I. Editions. *T. Livi a. u. c. libri*. Weissenborn's edition, by H. J. Müller. Vol. i. Part II. (Bk. 2). 8th edition. Berlin 1894. Has been subjected to a thorough revision, and more attention has rightly been given to the sense and use of language than to palaeographical matters. *T. Livi a. u. c. liber xxii.*, by F. Luterbacher. 3rd edition. Gotha 1894. This excellent edition has been carefully revised. C. Haupt, *Livius-Kommentar*. Books vi. vii. and (separately) book xxii. Leipzig 1893. Much to be commended, though there are traces of haste. *T. Livi a. u. c. liber xxix.*, by F. Luterbacher. Leipzig 1893. Maintains the high standard of L.'s work. *T. Livi a. u. c. libri*. Ed. A. Zingerle. Pars vi. Fasc. I. xxxvi.—xxxviii. Prag 1893, and A. Zingerle, *Zur vierten Dekade des Livius*. Wien 1893. The former is a careful and solid work, the latter (a dissertation) justifies Z.'s conjectures and emendations. W. Vollbrecht, *Auswahl aus Livius xxi.—xxx*. Leipzig 1893. An excellent selection, which might better be called 'The Hannibalian War.' H. Geist, *Was bieten die antiken Historiker der modernen Jugend?* Posen 1891. An admirable treatise which shows how the spirit of antiquity constantly renews humanity. G. Hergel, *Klassikerlektüre und Realien. Zur Livius lektüre*. Pr. Bräx 1892. Recommends for the study of *Realien* the original writers and not commentaries on them.

II. Contributions to criticism and elucidation. O. Keller, *Zu Livius*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1893. Contains five emendations. R. Bitschowsky, *Kleine Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung einiger Stellen des Livius*. Eranos Viindobonensis (Wien 1893). Critical notes on 2, 30, 1, 2, 36, 3 and 22, 31, 5. B. Kruczkiewicz, *Livianum*. Cracoviae 1893. On 1, 21, 4 defending the text *soli Fidei sollemne instituisse* [instituit?]. Scattered contributions are found as follows: E. Meyer (Pr. Herford 1893) on 1, 14, 8, C. v. Morawski (Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1893) on 9, 19, 6, F. Walter (Bl. f. d. GSW. 1893) on 9, 33, 3, W. Heraeus (WS. f. klass. Phil. 1893) on 10, 14, 18, F. Luterbacher (N. Jahr. f. Phil. 1894) on 21, 37, 4 the fifteen days of Hannibal's passage of the Alps, J. B. Greenough (Harvard Studies iii. 181) on 22, 17, 2, M. Müller (br. M.) on 22, 42, 12, 51, 5, 55, 8 and 58, 7, F. Fügner (Berl. Phil. WS. 1893) on 30, 25, 6 and 29, 4, E. Wölflin (Archiv f. lat. Lex. 1892) on 36, 15, 4, F. Luterbacher (N. Jahr. f. Phil. 1893) on 37, 56, 2, C. Funck (Archiv f. Lat. Lex. 1892) on 44, 31, 1 defends *utrariorum* against Madvig's *putearios*.

III. Lexicon, Sources, &c. *Lexicon Livianum*, conf. F. Fügner. Fasc. vi. *ambitio—annuus*. Comp. F. Schmidt. Leipzig 1894. R. Becker, *Bildnisse der Geschichtsschreiber Livius*. Leipzig 1890. Chiefly devoted to a description of a marble bust at Padua. C. v. Morawski, *Zur Rhetorik bei den römischen Historikern* (Livius, Velleius, Curtius). Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1893. W. Soltan, *Die annalistischen Quellen in Livius' vierter und fünfter Dekade*.

Philol. 52. S. maintains that Livy combined two sources of information (1) the pontifical annals through Piso and Valerius Antias, (2) for Greek and eastern events Polybius and Claudius. A. Volkmar, *De annalibus Romanis quaestiones*. I. de historia decemviratus. II. De T. Livio fonte Dionysi Halicarnassei. Diss. Marburg 1890. V. seeks to show in I. that L. has represented Caesar under the person of Appius Claudius. J. Schell, *De Sulpicio Severo Sallustianae, Livianae, Taciteae eloquentiis imitatore*. Diss. Münster 1892. W. Boguth, *Markus Valerius Laevinus*. Pr. Krems 1892. A most praiseworthy contribution to the history of the Second Punic War. J. Fuchs, *Der zweite Punische Krieg* and its sources, Polybius and Livius examined from a strategical standpoint. Shows thorough research and extensive knowledge, but the writer has attempted more than can be proved.

Addition. *T. Livi a. u. c. liber xxi.*, by F. Luterbacher. 4th edition. Gotha 1894. The early appearance of a new edition is a testimony to its worth.

Rheinisches Museum. Vol. xlix. Part 4. 1894.

Zwei neue Reden des Choricus, R. Förster. These two speeches are here first published from a Madrid MS. *Harpalyke*, G. Knaack. Confirms O. Crusius' remark (in Roscher's Mythological Lexicon) that Camilla is a Roman copy of Harpalyke, and refers to Servius and Hyginus. *Anecdota medica Graeca*, R. Fuchs. I. List of contents of cod. Paris. suppl. Graec. 636. II. Collation of fol. 102 v.—105 v. the Canon of Maximus Planudes. III. *Inedita medica* from pp. 21—82. *Autor- und Verlagsrecht in Alterthum*, K. Dziatzko. Concludes that these did not exist among the Greeks and Romans. *Zur Datirung des Delphischen Paeen und der Apollo-Hymnen*, H. Pomtow. The Paeon 230—220 B.C., the four hymns at different times 185—135 B.C. *Das Regenwunder der Marc-Aurel-Säule*, A. v. Domaszewski. Seeks to show that the evidence of this column is against the genuineness of the Christian legend of the 'thundering legion.' MISCELLANEOUS. *Zu Aeschylus Choephoren*, J. M. Stahl. A redistribution of ll. 498—511. *Theopomp*, E. Rohde. On a letter of Alexander the Great to the Chians. *Parthenius*, F. Rohde. On a passage at the end of ch. 36. *Γάσσοι*, H. Rabe. From cod. Marc. gr. 433. *Zur Datirung der Halle der Athener zu Delphi*, H. Pomtow. B.C. 490 is the *terminus ante quem*. *Zu Martial* ii. 17, Ch. Hulsen. *Die Gallischen Steuern bei Ammian*, O. Seck. On Amm. Marc. xvi. 5, 14.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 149. Parts 10, 11. 1894.

Fasti Delphici II. 1, H. Pomtow. This (a concluding article) is on the Amphictyonic decrees of the second century B.C. with a revision of the text and four appendices. *Kritische bemerkungen zu Xenophons Kyropädie*, K. Lünke. Among the passages discussed is the long one viii. 5, §§ 2—16, and v. 2, §§ 16—19 on the supper in the Persian camp. *Zu Xenophons apomnemoneumata*, P. R. Müller. Suggests ἡ ὄρου in i. 5, 1 for ἡ πύου, comparing ii. 6, 1. *Zur Eudemischen ethik*, O. Apelt. On various passages in the seventh and eighth books, from 1235^b—1248^a. Also a few passages in the first book are noted. *Zur behandlung des Sapphischen massen bei Horatius*, R. Köpke. From the fact that the fem. caesura in the dactyl is found in 25% of the sapphic lines in the fourth book of the odes and the carn. saec., and only in 14% of those lines in the first three books, it is concluded

that Horace deliberately in the last book (and in i. 30 by way of experiment) emancipated himself from the Roman school-theory which required the masc. caesura, into the greater freedom of his Greek models. *Zu Caesars bellum Gallicum*, G. Hubo. In i. 52, 4 *reiectis pilis comminus gladiis pugnatum est*, for *reiectis* reads *relictis* the reading of most MSS. *Studien zur überlieferung und Kritik der metamorphosen Ovids*, H. Magnus. IV. Marcius and Neapolitanus 2. *Der Bubastische Nilarm*, W. Schwarz. Greek writers who did not live in Egypt (as Diodorus) spoke of a Pelusiac branch of the Nile, those who lived in Egypt (as Manetho und Ptolemaeus) spoke of a Bubastic branch and a Pelusiac mouth.

Mnemosyne, N.S. Vol. xxii. Part 4.

De Theogonia Orphica (concluded), A. E. J. Holwerda. The passage of Damascius does not by itself prove that an Orphic *theologia* beginning with Νύξ ever existed. Yet scholars join the Orphic verses found in Plato, taking them from the *ῥαψῳδία* to which they belong (ἡ συνήθης ὀρχική *theologia* ἡ ἐν ῥαψῳδίαις says Damasc.), with the Νύξ

of Aristotle or Eudemus with which they have no connexion. *Analecta critica*, L. K. Enthoven. Notes on passages of Appian, Artemidorus, Dionys. Halic., Dio Chrysost., Herodian, Plutarch, Themistocle. epist., and Zosimus. *Observationes criticae ad epistolographos Graecos*, G. M. Sakorraphus. The result of the examination of some MSS. at Vienna and some Italian cities. Notes on the letters of Aristaeus (Cod. Vindob. 310). A text is given of the *ῥήτο. ἐπιστολικοί* of Demetrius Phalereus by the aid of Cod. Marcius 418, and the variations are noted from Hecker's ed. *Cic. de prov. cons.* § 33, J. v. d. V. *Varroniana*, I. C. G. Boot. Passages in the *De lingua latina* considered. *Ad Cic. oral. pro Cluentio annotatiunculae criticae*, J. J. Hartman. *Observatiunculae de iure Romano* (continued), J. C. Naber. This treats of *De conditione propter poenitentiam*, de possessionis conditione, de conditione fructuum, and de constitutione ad Aufidium Victorinum. *Ad Homerī Iliadem*, H. v. H. On Z 335 suggests *νεμεστωί* for *νεμέσαι* and on I 707 *μόλη* for *φανή*. Valerius Maximus (ii. 1, 8), J. v. d. V.

R. C. S.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aristotle*. Politics. A revised text, with introduction, analysis and commentary by Franz Susemihl and R. D. Hicks. Books I.—V. 8vo. xv, 689 pp. Macmillan & Co. 18s. net.
- Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. With a critical text and a translation of The Poetics, by S. H. Butcher. 8vo. xix, 384 pp. Macmillan & Co. 10s. net.
- Burton* (E. de W.). Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. 220 pp. Clark. 5s. 6d. net.
- Collar* (W. C.) and *Daniell* (M. G.). The First Latin Book. 12mo. xiii, 286 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. Illustrated. \$1. 10.
- Cornelius Nepos*, Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Pausanias, Cimon, with notes and vocabulary for beginners, by E. S. Shuckburgh. Fcp. 8vo. ix, 86 pp. Cambridge Press. 1s. 6d.
- Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*. No. III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton. 8vo. Boards. viii, 136 pp. \$1. 25.
- Daves* (E. A. S.). The Pronunciation of the Greek Aspirates. 8vo. 103 pp. Sewed. Nutt. 2s. net.
- Furtwängler* (A.). Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture. A series of essays on the history of art. Edited by Eugénie Sellers. With 19 full plates and 200 text illustrations. Folio. 486 pp. Heinemann. 63s. net.
- Gleason*. The Gate to the Anabasis. With colloquia, notes and vocabulary. By Clarence W. Gleason, Master in the Roxbury Latin School, Boston. 'School Classics Series.' 16mo. iv, 107 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. 45 cents.
- Hammond* (B. E.). The Political Institutions of the ancient Greeks. 8vo. Cambridge Press. 4s.
- Homer*. Iliad. Book XXIV. With introduction, notes and appendices, by G. M. Edwards. Fcp. 8vo. xxxvi, 74 pp. Cambridge Press. 2s.
- Odysseus. Books V.—VIII. Edited with introduction and notes by B. Perrin, Professor of Greek in Yale University. 'College Series of Greek Authors.' Square 12mo. iv, 186 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. \$1. 50. Text Edition. 62 pp. 45 cents.
- Horace*. Odes. Books 1 and 2 done into English verse, and Andromeda, Ariadne, and Jason, by J. H. Deazeley. Impl. 16mo. Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d. net.
- The Historical and Political Odes. With introduction and notes, by A. J. Church. Post 8vo. 146 pp. Blackie and Son. 2s. 6d.
- Horatius*. Odes and Epodes. Edited with introduction and notes by Clement L. Smith, Professor of Latin in Harvard University. 'College Series of Latin Authors.' 12mo. lxxxvii, 404 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. \$1. 60. Text Edition. 45 cents.
- Lindsay* (W. M.). The Latin Language: an historical account of Latin sounds, stems, and flexions. 8vo. 660 pp. Clarendon Press. 21s.
- Lucian's True History. Translated by Francis Hickes: illustrated by William Strang, J. B. Clark and Audrey Beardsley: with an introduction by Charles Whibley, 4to. 270 pp. Privately printed. 42s. net.
- Lord* (F. E.). The Roman Pronunciation of Latin. Why we use it and How to use it. 12mo. iv, 58 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. 40 cents.
- Pater* (Walter). Greek Studies, a series of Essays prepared for the Press by Charles L. Shadwell. 8vo. ix, 315 pp. Macmillan & Co. 10s. 6d.
- Perrot* (G.) and *Chipiez* (C.). History of Art in Primitive Greece. Mycenaean Art from the French, illustrated, with 544 engravings in the text, and 20 coloured plates. 2 Vols. Roy. 8vo. 1046 pp. Chapman. 42s.
- Plato*. Republic. The Greek text. Edited, with notes and essays, by the late B. Jowett and Lewis Campbell. 3 Vols. Roy. 8vo. Clarendon Press, 42s.

Plutarch's life of Pericles. With introduction, critical and explanatory notes and indices, by H. A. Holden. 12mo. 360 pp. Macmillan & Co. 4s. 6d.

Post (Edwin.) Latin at Sight. With an introduction, selections for sight reading, and selections for practice. 12mo. x, 210 pp. Cloth. Boston, Ginn. 90 cents.

Sallust. Jugurthine War. Edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by Edward P. Coleridge. 18mo. 188 pp. Macmillan & Co. 1s. 6d.

Sonnenschein (E. A.) A Greek Grammar for Schools. Accidence and Syntax in 1 Vol. Post 8vo. Sonnenschein. 4s. 6d.

Tacitus. Dialogus de Oratoribus. Edited with introduction and notes, by Charles E. Bennett. Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Cornell University. 'College Series of Latin Authors.' 12mo. xxviii, 87 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. 80 cents. Text Edition. Paper. 45 cents.

Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus. Edited with prolegomena, critical apparatus, exegetical and critical

notes, bibliography and indexes, by Alfred Gudeman, Professor of Classical Philology in University of Pennsylvania. Square 8vo. ix, 578 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. \$3.

Thucydides. Book III. Edited with introduction and notes, by C. Forster Smith, Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. 'College Series of Greek Authors.' Square 12mo. xi, 320 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. \$1. 75. Text Edition. 77 pp. 45 cents.

Vergil. Aeneid. Book VIII. Edited with notes, word-groups and vocabulary by John Tetlow, Head-Master of the Boston Girls' High and Latin Schools. 'School Classics Series.' 16mo. xii, 191 pp. Boston, Ginn. Cloth. Illustrated. 50 cents. Without vocabulary. xii, 105 pp. 40 cents.

Xenophon. Anabasis. Books I.—IV. Revised edition by William W. Goodwin, Professor of Greek Literature, and John Williams White, Professor of Greek, in Harvard University. 12mo. lii, 572 pp. Boston, Ginn. Illustrated. Half bound. \$1. 65.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aeschylus' Agamemnon, mit Anmerkungen von R. Enger, 3. Aufl. neu bearbeitet von Th. Plüss. Leipzig, Teubner. 8vo. viii, 187 pp. 2 M. 25.

Aesop. Sternbach (L.) Dilucidationes Aesopiae. 8vo. 50 pp. Krakau. 1 Mk. 50.

(Aus 'Dissertationes Acad. litterarum Cracov.') Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum, edd. F. Buecheler et Alex. Riese. Pars II. Carmina latina epigraphica, conlegit F. Buecheler. Fasc. I. 8vo. 398 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Aristophanes. Lettner (G.) Bau, Wesen u. Bedeutung des sogenannten Agons in den aristophanischen Komödien. Lemberg. 8vo. 19 pp.

Ausonius (Decimus Magnus) Mosella. Lateinisch, mit deutscher Uebersetzung von R. E. Ottmann. Trier, Lintz. 8vo. 88 pp. 1 M. 50.

Barth (W.) Kaiser Zeno. Basel. 8vo. 124 pp.

Bernoulli (J. J.) Römische Iconographie. Vol. II. Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser und ihrer Angehörigen. III. Von Pertinax bis Theodosius. (Schluss.) With 66 plates and 8 engravings. 8vo. xii, 275 pp. Stuttgart, Union. 24 Mk.

Blaydes (Fred. H. M.) Adversaria in tragicorum graecorum fragmenta. 8vo. vii, 423 pp. Halle, Waisenhans. 8 Mk.

Boetticher (E.) Troja im Jahre 1894. Enthüllungen gegenüber dem Phantasiestück im Deutschen Reichsanzeiger No. 222. Schwerin. 8vo. iii, 34 pp. 1 M. 50.

Calpurnius. Chytil (F.) Der Eklogendichter T. Calpurnius Siculus und seine Vorbilder. Znaim. 8vo. 24 pp.

Cicero. Dieckhoff (O.) De Ciceronis libris de natura deorum recensendis. Göttingen. 8vo. 79 pp.

— Hildebrandt (P.) De scholiis Ciceronis Bobiensibus. Berlin. 8vo. 63 pp.

— Stoerling (G.) Quaestiones Ciceronianae ad religionem spectantes. Jena. 8vo. 41 pp.

Claudianus. Arens (E.) Quaestiones Claudianae. Münster. 8vo. 42 pp.

Clemens. Arnim (J. v.) De octavo Clementis Stromateorum libro. Rostock. 4to. 16 pp.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum. Vol. VI. Pars

IV. Fasc. I. Folio. pp. v, et 2459—3601. Berlin, Reimer. 58 Mk.

Contains: Inscriptiones Urbis Romae latinae, collegerunt W. Henzen et J. B. de Rossi, Eng. Bormann, ed. Ch. Huelsen. P. IV. Fasc. I.

Curtius. Damsté (P. H.) Lectiones Curtianae. Leiden. 8vo. 31 pp.

Curtius (E.) und Kaupert (J. A.) Karten von Attika, 1:25000, auf Veranlassung des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts aufgenommen. Mit erläuterndem Text. Part VIII. (last). 5 maps. 46, 5 x 40 cm. Berlin, Reimer. 13 M.

Demosthenes. Haar (B. ter) Demosthenis quae fertur oratio adversus Polycelem annotationibus illustrata. Sneek. 8vo. viii, 154 pp.

Ehe (Gust.) Abriss der Kunstgeschichte des Alterthums. In synchronistisch vergleichender Darstellung. Royal 8vo. xx, 675 pp. 4 plates, 557 engravings. Düsseldorf, Schwann. 26 Mk.

Epictetus. Zahn (T.) Der Stoiker Epiktet und sein Verhältnis zum Christentum. Erlangen. 4to. 27 pp.

Euripides. Swoboda (A.) Beiträge zur Beurtheilung des unechten Schlusses von Euripides' Iphigenie in Aulis (Fortsetzung und Schluss). Karlsbad. 8vo. 17 pp.

Eusebius. Heinrici (C. F. G.) Das Urchristentum in der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius. Leipzig. 4to. 79 pp.

Flensburg (N.) Zur Stammabstufung der mit Nasal-suffix gebildeten Präsenta im Arischen und Griechischen. 8vo. 72 pp. Lund. 2 Mk. 25.

Frank (K.) Bemerkungen zur Chronologie der Pentekontaetia. Schönberg. 8vo. 22 pp.

Gantzer (P.) Verfassungs- und Gesetzrevision in Athen vom Jahre 411 bis auf das Archontat des Eukleides. Halle. 8vo. 67 pp.

Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Iwan von Müller. Vol. VI. Part III. 8vo. xx, 625—953 pp. München, Beck. 5 Mk. 50.

Contains the conclusion of: Sittl (K.) Archäologie der Kunst.

- Helbig* (W.) *L'épopée Homérique expliquée par les monuments. Traduction française de F. Trawinski, avec introduction par Max. Collignon.* Paris. 8vo. xv, 605 pp.
- Hermann* (K. Fr.) *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten, neu herausgegeben von H. Blümner und W. Dittenberger.* Vol. II. Part I. 8vo. ix, 183 pp. Freiburg, Mohr. 4 Mk.
- Contains: *Lehrbuch der griechischen Rechtsalterthümer*, 4 Auflage, bearbeitet von Th. Thalheim.
- Homer. Knötel* (A. F. R.) *Homerus, der Blinde von Chios und seine Werke.* Vol. I. 8vo. xiv, 378 pp. Leipzig, Grunow. 4 Mk. 50.
- *Menrad, über die neuentdeckten Genfer Homerfragmente und den Werth ihrer Varianten.* München. 8vo. 18 pp.
- *Ribbeck* (W.). *Homeric Formlehre.* 3rd Edition. 8vo. vi, 85 pp. Berlin, Rockenstein. Cloth. 1 Mk. 80.
- Horatius. Gemoll* (W.) *Die Realien bei Horaz. Part IV. (last). Das Sacralwesen. Die Familie Gewerbe und Künste. Der Staat.* 8vo. 188 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 3 Mk. 20.
- *Mészáros* (F.) *Quaestiones de epistola ad Pisones Q. Horatii Flacci.* Klausenburg. 8vo. 56 pp.
- Isocrates. Drerup* (E.) *De codicum Isocrateorum auctoritate.* Leipzig. 8vo. 59 pp.
- Joseph* (Dr. D.) *Die Paläste des homerischen Epos mit Rücksicht auf die Ausgrabungen Heinr. Schliemanns.* 2nd edition. Berlin, Siemens. 8vo. viii, 107 pp. 2 plates. 2 M.
- Josephi* (Flavii.) *Opera, ed. apparatu critico instr.* Ben. Niese. Vol. VI. 8vo. Berlin, Weidmann. 26 Mk.
- IV. *De bello Judaico libros VII edd. J. A. Destinon et Ben. Niese.* lxxvi, 628 pp.
- Jünemann* (A.) *De legione Romanorum I. adiutrice.* Leipzig. 8vo. 39 pp.
- Kern* (O.) *Die Gründungsgeschichte von Magnesia am Maiandros. Eine neue Urkunde, erläutert.* Royal 4to. 27 pp., 1 facsimile plate. Berlin, Weidmann. 4 Mk.
- Levy* (H.) *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen.* 8vo. Berlin, Gärtner. 7 Mk.
- Limes, der ob germanisch-rätische, des Römerreiches.* Im Auftrag der Reichslimes-Commission herausgegeben von O. von Sarwey und F. Hettner. (In 40-50 parts.) Part I. Heidelberg, Petters. 4to. 27, 13, 8 pp. Engravings and 6 plates. In portfolio. 5 M. each part.
- Livius. Soltan* (W.) *Livius' Quellen in der dritten Decade.* 8vo. ix, 148 pp. Berlin, Mayer & M. 3 Mk.
- Lucretius. Jezienicki* (M.) *Quaestiones Lucretianae.* Aus 'Eos.' 8vo. 28 pp. Lemberg. 1 Mk.
- Maass* (O.) *Kleitarch und Diodor. Eine Quellenuntersuchung.* I. 8vo. 83 pp. St. Petersburg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Menander. Ἀποστολόπουλος, Μ., Μένανδρος Προτέκτωρ Μιμήτης Ἀγαθίου.* Erlangen. 8vo. 40 pp.
- Meyer* (E.) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen.* Halle. 4to. 31 pp.
- Mommsen.* *Römische Geschichte.* Vol. V. *Die Provinzen von Caesar bis Diocletian.* With 10 maps by H. Kiepert. 4th edition. 8vo. viii, 659 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 Mk.
- Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctorum antiquissimorum tomi XIII. Pars I.* 4to. 222 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 Mk. On writing paper. 12 Mk.
- Contains: *Chronica minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII, ed. Th. Mommsen.* Vol. III. Fasc. I.
- Mueller* (Lucian.) *De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium libri VII. Acced. opuscula auctoris IV. Ed. secunda.* 8vo. xii, 651 pp. St. Petersburg. 14 Mk.
- Müller* (Prof. Dr. E.) *Sokrates in der Volksversammlung.* Zittau. 8vo. 16 pp. 75 Pf.
- Olympia.* *Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung, herausgegeben von E. Curtius und Fr. Adler.* Vol. III. of the letterpress, 1. half volume, and Vol. III. of the plates. Royal 4to. and Royal Folio. Berlin, Asher. 300 Mk.
- Contains: *Die Bildwerke in Stein und Thon, bearbeitet von G. Treu.* (First half: 137 pp., 1 map, and engravings.) With volume of plates (69 plates in heliogravure, 1 leaf of letterpress.)
- Peyre* (R.) *L'empire romain.* Square 8vo. 323 pp., engravings. Paris, May et Motteroz. 7 Fr. 50 cents.
- Plautus. Leo* (Fr.) *De Plauti Vidularia commentatio.* 8vo. 19 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich. 50 Pf.
- Programm* (54.) *zum Winckelmannsfeste der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin.* 4to. 19 pp., 5 engravings, 2 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 2 Mk.
- Contains: *Kekulé* (R.) *Ueber einen bisher Marcellus genannten Kopf in den Kgl. Museen.*
- Reinach* (S.) *Antiquités nationales du Musée de Saint Germain en Laye. Bronze figures de la Gaule romaine.* 8vo. xv, 385 pp., 1 plate, 600 engravings. Paris, Didot. 10 Fr.
- Ribbeck* (O.) *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. I. Dichtung der Republik.* 2nd edition. 8vo. ix, 358 pp. Stuttgart, Cotta. 8 Mk.
- Rochl* (H.) *Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum, in usum scholarum.* 4to. iii, 87 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 6 Mk.
- Schwartz* (E.) *Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor mit Excursen über die Interpolationen bei Africanus und Eusebius.* 4to. 96 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich. 10 Mk.
- (Aus 'Abhandlungen der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen.')
- Studien* (Leipziger) *zur classischen Philologie, herausgegeben von O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, (Wachsmuth.)* Vol. XVI. 8vo. iii, 171 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 6 Mk.
- Toutain* (J.) *De Saturni dei in Africa Romana cultu.* 8vo. 143 pp. Paris, Belin.
- Winter* (Frz.) *Ueber die griechische Porträtkunst.* 8vo. 26 pp., engravings. Berlin, Spemann. 3 Mk.
- Wörner* (Emil.) *De Arietho et Agathyllo fabulae apud Arcades Aeneiae auctoribus.* 8vo. iv, 26 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs. 1 Mk.
- Xenophon. Rafner* (O.) *Die sogenannte Socratiche Methode, dargestellt nach Xenophon's Memorabilien und auf deren Anwendung im Gymnasialunterricht geprüft.* 8vo. 27 pp. St. Paul.